THE

PRINCESS OF WALES

SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

Edited by

GOPĪ NĀTHA KAVIRĀJA

VOL. VI.

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES.

1927
(Price Rupees five for each volume).

Saleable at half the printed price.

[illegible]

1123

KAV

Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan's Sri Sankaracharya Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya ★
144.

THE
PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

EDITED BY
GOPĪ NĀTHA KAVIRĀJA

Vol. VI.

Printed by Rameshwar Pathak, at the Tara Printing Works,
Benares and published under the authority of the Government
of the United Provinces by the Superintendent of the
Government Press, Allahabad.

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES.

1927.

BVB Sri Sankaracharya Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya
144

Bharatiya Vidya ★ Bhawan's Sri Sankaracha… …rit Mahavidyalaya
144

CONTENTS.

Papers Pages.

I. INDEX TO ŚABARA'S BHĀṢYA: By The Late Col. G. A. Jacob... ... 1—18

II. SOME ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF THE NĀTHAS: By Gopinath Kaviraj... ... ... 19—43

III. AN INDEX TO THE RĀMĀYAṆA: By Manmatha Nath Rāy... ... 45—108

IV. STUDIES IN HINDU LAW: By Gaṅgānāth Jhā .... 109—164

V. THE MĪMĀMSĀ MANUSCRIPTS IN THE GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY (BENARES): By Gopinath Kaviraj .... 165—196

VI. NOTES AND QUERIES: By Gopinath Kaviraj... ... 197—198

I.—INDEX TO SABARA'S BHAṢYA

(Books I-IV)

By the late Col. G. A. Jacob.

Continued from Vol. III, p. 39.

"**वामदेव्यं गायते**" (T B. 1. 1. 8. 2), 280.

"**वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत** etc.," 181. 482 (T. S. 2. 1. 1. 1).

वारणपात्र, a vessel made of the wood of the Varaṇa tree; it may be used at a **यज्ञ** but not in connection with a **होम**, 236-7.

वारवन्तीय, N. of a saman used at the Agniṣṭoma,—162. ["Originally composed for, and named after, Ṛ.V. i. 27. 1 "**अश्वं नत्वा वारवन्तं** etc." Eggeling, vol iii, p. xiv.]

"**वारवन्तीयं गायते**" (TB. 1. 1. 8. 3),-280.

"**वारुणेनैककपालेनावभृथमभ्यवयन्ति**" 480.

वार्त्रघ्नीन्याय (Sūtra 3. 1. 23),—238.

"**वार्त्रघ्नी पौर्णमास्यां**",—238 (TS. 2. 5. 2. 5. slightly modified).

वासिष्ठाः 735—6.

"**वासिष्ठो ब्रह्मा भवति**", 736 (see TS. 3. 5. 2. 1).

"***वास्तुमध्ये रौद्रं चरुं निर्वपेत्** etc." 632.

विदेवन, playing (with dice) at a **राजसूय** sacrifice (Śatap. v. 4. 4. 6. 23),—516—17, 565.

"**विद्यामधीयीत**",—651.

विधिलक्षण, found in a verse beginning with **कुर्यात् क्रियेत कर्तव्यं** etc",—490.

---

*Cf. Āpast. Śr. ix. 14. 11.

विधिविभक्ति, a termination indicating injuction,—490, 493, 495, 501.

विधृति, N. of two blades of grass laid across the *barhis* to keep it apart from the *prastara* (Eggeling's note on iii. 4. 1. 18. See, too, i. 3. 4. 10),—429.

विनिरुप्त = सामिनिरुप्त, half of an offering having been presented,—708—9.

विनिर्देश, declaration, announcement (as to a 3-fold division of property, with a view to limiting the quantity to be given as **सर्वस्वदान**),—748.

" **विनिषद्योद्गातारः साम्ना स्तुवते** ",—353.

विप्रतिपत्ति, a conflict (between 2 texts),—547.

विप्रलंभक उपदेशः, misleading advice (regarding a road),—497.

विभक्ति विपरिणाम (a technical term explained by Kunte under sūtra 4. 3. 3, but is not in Śabara).

" **विरुध्यमाने कल्पः स्यात्** etc,"—137.

"**वि वा एनं प्रजया.......अर्द्धर्यति** etc", 701 (T. S. 2. 5. 5.1).

विशदसिद्धि (?),—307.

विश्वजिन्न्याय,—496, 742 etc.

" **विश्वामित्रो होता भवति**" 736.

विष्णुक्रम, 'the Viṣṇu-strides'—3 steps to be taken by the sacrificer at certain sacrifices [Śatap. i. 9. 3. 8 ; vi. 6. 4. 1 ; vi. 7. 2. 10]. As a man without legs sacrifices,—[207, 267 in Jhā],—605-6, 628.

"**विष्णुरुपांशु यष्टव्यः** etc",—144.

विहवाः *[Ṛ. V. X. 128, where Griffith explains the term thus :—**विविधमाहूयन्ते येषु शूरा इति विहवाः संग्रामाः । यद्वा विविधं यागार्थं देवा आहूयन्त एष्विति विहवा यज्ञाः**. It is not in Vedic Index.]—425.

---

*TS. 4. 7. 14. 1.

वृत्तिकार, quoted,—7, 126—7, 161, 211.

" **वृद्धवयाः प्रत्युत्थेयः संमन्तव्यश्च**",—647, 650.

वेद, a brush for sweeping the altar, 69 [See Eggeling's note to i. 2. 1. 22].

" **वेदं कृत्वा वेदिं कुर्वीत**",—69.

वेदि, the Sama altar,—69.

"**वेद्यां हवींषि सादयति**",—387 (TB. 1. 6. 5. 1).

वैकंकट पात्राणि, vessels of Vaikaṅkaṭa wood ; they can be used both at **यज्ञ** *and* at **होम**, whilst those made of the wood of the Varaṇa can only be used at the former,—236, 237.

वैमृध, connected with Indra (**विमृध्**), 508 (See TS. 2. 5. 3. 1 etc.).

वैयधिकरण्य,—85.

वैराजपृष्ठ, "when performed in its **पृष्ठ** form the Stotra is so arranged that a certain sāman is enclosed as the *garbha* (embryo) within some other sāman who, as its **पृष्ठ** (i. e. back or flanks), is chanted a number of times before and after the verses of the central sāman". The times most commonly used for the enclosing sāmans of a **पृष्ठस्तोत्र** are Rathantara and Bṛihat....Vairūpa (Sāman Veda ii. 212, 213), *Vairāja* (ii. 277—9), Śakwara, and Raivata Sāmans (Eggeling, vol. 3, p. xx),—434.

वैराज सामन् (see above),—434.

वैरूप पृष्ठ and **वैरूप सामन्** (see above the extract from Eggeling),—434.

"**वैश्यो वैश्य* स्तोमेन यजेत**",—740.

---

* An Ekāha sacrifice for which Kaṇva Rathantara Sāman is prescribed (Jai ix. 2. 48 and Āpast 22. 10. 3).

वैश्वदेव, one of the triennial (or 4-monthly) sacrifices,—96, 157 (Śatap. ii. 5. 1).

"*वैश्वदेवीं सांग्रहणीं निर्वपेद्ग्रामकामः" (TS. 2. 3. 9. 2),—506, 519, 656.

वैश्वदेव्यामित्ता,—157, 449.

वैश्वानरं द्वादशकपालं निर्वपेत्पुत्रे जाते" (TS. 2. 2. 5. 3),—97, 511—12.

व्यक्ति, 79 (असाधारणविशेषा व्यक्तिः) ; 81 (यो ह्यर्थः सामान्यस्य विशेषाणां च आश्रय: सा व्यक्तिः

"व्यत्यस्त मृतव्या उपदधाति" 542 (TS. V. 3. 1. 1 omits व्यत्यस्तं 'backwards and forwards').

"व्यत्यस्तं षोडशिनं शंसति,"—542 (TS. vii. 1. 5. 4 without व्यत्यस्तं).

व्यपाश्रय (=अन्यत्र विनियोग:, so *Sūtra vṛtti*),— 679.

व्यवधारण कल्पना, one of the varieties of the Brahmaṇa (see p. 572 of Transṇ of *Tantravārtika* ; and for other divisions, p. 111 of Jhā on Prabhākara),—127.

व्यवाय (√ वे) separation by insertion of words between two parts of a sentence, 136, 234.

"व्यस्तं वा एते संवत्सरस्याभिदीक्षन्ते etc." (T. S. vii. 4. 8. 1),—715.

व्याकोश, 'open' (i. e. the hands forming the अञ्जलि are to be side by side *open*, and not put together *closed*, as for a salutation),—107.

व्यापन्न, sported, corrupted (and therefore unfit for an Ārya),—720.

"व्यापन्नमप्सु प्रहरति", 720.

व्यृध् व्यृध्यते, to be deprived of, 334 (See T. S. 2. 3. 2. 45).

---

*Āpast. *Srauta* xix. 23. 6.

व्रत (as प्रजापति व्रत) is a mental act, a vow or determination,—645-6.

"व्रतं कृणुत etc." (T.S. 6. 1. 4. 4.),—251.

"व्रत्येऽहनि पत्न्यना*लंभुका स्यात् तामपरुध्य यजेत,—325. (T. B. 3. 7. 1. 9). Āpast. ix. 2. 1.

व्रीहिमयं संकल्पन यवमयः प्रदेयः 321.

व्रीहियववत् , an example of option,—67.

"व्रीहीनवहन्ति तण्डुलान्पिनष्टि ",—483.

"शकृत्संप्रविध्यति",—4 3.

"शतमधिरथं दुहितृमते दद्यात् etc.",—610, 612.

शतं ब्राह्मणाः सोमान् भक्षयन्ति etc.," 364.

शता तृण्णायां विक्षारयन्ति",—347 [cf. T. B. 1. 8. 6. 4 ; and Śatap xii.9.1.3, where शतातृण्णा is rendered "perforated with 100 holes".]

शब्द प्रमाणका वयं यच्छब्द आह तदस्माकं प्रमाणम् ,--271.

"शमितारमुपनयीत",—400.

शमितृ, the slayer (of the sacrificial animal),—400.

"शमीमय्यः स्रुर्यभवन्ति हिरण्मय्यो वा",—118.

†शम्यु, N. of a son of Bṛhaspati, 324. (See Sāyaṇa on TS. 2. 6. 10. 1, and शम्युवाक in Index to Jhā)

शम्युवाक, 676 [See Index to Jhā's Prabhākara Mīmāṃsā]

शरीरग्रहणस्य तुन अदृष्टादृते किंचित्कारणमस्ति,—507.

‡"शरेषीकयानक्ति" ('He anoints him with a straw of Darbha grass.' *Kunte*),—413.

शवशिरःस्पर्शन, 727.

---

* अनाल भुका स्प्रष्टुमयोग्या रजस्वला " (Sāyaṇa)

† See Śatap. 1. 9. 1. 24 etc.

‡ [For another reference to शरेषिका see Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta xvii. 3. 11] The *quotation*, I *now find*, is *from* Śatap. iii. 1. 3. 13 where Egg. renders it, "He anoints (the eyes) *with a reed—stalk*".

*शाक्यानामयनं षट्त्रिंशत्संवत्सरम्, 433 [So, too, *Kātyāyana Śrauta* xxiv. 176 (p. 952), on wh: the same says :- शाक्यानामयनमिति संज्ञा सत्रस्य 1....तत्र तरसमयाः पुरोडाशा भवन्ति ॥ But in *Tāṇḍya Br*. xxv. 7. 1 this is called शाक्त्यानां सत्रं, and in the next sūtra it is stated that the Śaktya Gauriviti who used a Puroḍāśa of meat attained universal prosperity by means of that sacrificial session, at the river Yavyavati. The Āpastamba and Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtras also read शाक्त्यानां. Kunte has the reading of Śabara.].

शाखया गाः प्रा†पयति" (TB. 3. 2. 1. 2),—474.
"शाखया वत्सानपाकरोति" (TB. 3. 2. 1. 1),—474.
शाखावाद,—472.
शाखा हरण,—377.

"शाल्यर्थं कुल्याः प्रणीयन्ते etc," 220, 491. [Mahābhāṣya 1, 1. 23 (Vārt. 4) etc.]

शास्त्र=verbal testimony,—10.
शास्त्रकाराः,—13 (last line).
शास्त्रं चानतिशंक्यं पितृमातृवचनादपि प्रमाणतरम् ,—439.
शास्त्रफलं प्रयोक्तरि (sūtra 3. 7. 18),—395.
"शास्त्राणि चेत्प्रमाणं स्युः etc",—567.
"शिरो वा एतद्यज्ञस्य यदाग्नेयः",—531.
शिरो वा एतद्यज्ञस्य यद्दीक्षणीया",—536.
शिल्पोपजीवित्व,—630—1

शिष्टविगर्हण, blame given by the learned to one who begins a thing but does not finish it, ; they call him a प्राक्रमिक,—504.

---

* So, too, Vol. ii, p. 172 (ix. 1. 39).

† *T.B. has* प्रर्वयति.

शिष्टाः (or शास्त्रस्थाः) are the sole judges of correct language ; whilst म्लेच्छाः are more skilled in the capture and care of birds,—70, 71.

शिष्टाचार,—71.

शुक्तिकायां रजतविज्ञानम् ,—424.

शुक्तिकाहि रजतवत्प्रकाशते तेन प्रत्यक्षं व्यभिचरति,—7.

शुनश्चतुर्दश्यामुपवसतः पश्यामः श्येनांश्चाष्टस्याम् (?),—604,606.

“शुन्धध्वं दैव्याय कर्मणे ,” 294 (T.S. 1. 1. 3. 1—‘Become pure for divine work’).

“शुषिरो वा एतर्हि पशुर्यर्हि वपामुत्खिदन्ति”,—778.

शूद्राः may not offer sacrifice,—621-27.

“शूद्रेण नाध्येतव्यम् ”,—626.

शून्य =शून्यवाद of Buddhists,—9.

शेष, ‘subsidiary’—that which is for the sake of another, aiding some action towards the fulfilment of its अपूर्व,—208[“यः परस्योपकारे वर्तते स शेषः.’ Bhāṣya on sūtra 2].

शेषभक्षण, the eating of remnants of sacrificial cakes etc. by the priest,—676.

“शेषादिडामवद्यति etc.”,—337, 456.

शोभनमस्य चक्रस्य नेमितुम्बारम् ,—49.

शौनःशेफाख्यान, at a Rājasūya,—294, 516 (*Ait. Br.* vii. 13, vol. 4, p. 59)

“श्नथद्वृत्रं” (RV. 6. 60. 1),—256, 283.

श्येन, ‘hawk—sacrifice’,—5, 90, 410, 416, 431—2 (not in Vedic Index in this sense).

“श्येनचितं चिन्वीत” (T. S. 5. 4. 11. 1),—80.

“श्येनेनाभिचरन्यजेत” (*Āpast. Śr.* xxii. 4. 13),—5, 90.

श्रयणवत् (√ श्री),—‘like the mixing (of some juice with milk’, in the offering to Mitrā—Varuṇa, T. S. 6. 4. 8. 1),—697.

श्रुतिक्रम, 'direct enunciation', 'declaration', as in the Veda, —537, 586. [See Thibaut's Transn. of *Arthasaṅgraha*, p. 22]

श्रुतिबलीयस्त्वन्याय,—537.

श्रुतिलक्षणाविशये श्रुति ज्यायसी,—86.

श्रेयस्कर,—5.

श्वमाजीरसम्बन्ध in connection with the eating of **ओदन**,— 226.

षट्चिति, consisting of 6 layers of bricks (the fire—altar), —522.

"**षट्त्रिंशत्प्रक्रमा प्राची** etc", 389 (cf. T. S. 6. 2. 4. 5)

"**षट्पदान्यनु निष्क्रामति**" (T. S. 6. 1. 8. 1; See Eggeling's note to 3. 3. 1. 1),—451.

"**षडुपसदः** ," 568.

षड्भिर्हलैः कर्षति, used to illustrate the fact that a man is sometimes said to do himself that wh : he does through others,—333.

षड्विधः कर्मभेदः (as **शब्दान्तर**, **अभ्यास**, **संख्या**, **गुण**, **प्रक्रिया**, **नामधेय**),—108.

षोडशिन्, a Soma sacrifice [See Eggeling, vol 3, p. xvi], 383-6, 719 ; a Soma cup, and a *Stotra*,—555.

संयवन (√**यु**), mixing sacrificial water with the flour of the Puroḍāśa [see Kunte on 4. 2. 14, 15, and com. on Āpast. Sr. 1. 16. 11],—477.

संयोगपृथक्त्वन्याय, 493.

"**संवत्सरो वा एनं प्रतिष्ठायै नुदति** etc," (TS.5. 4, 2, 2),—523.

संस्कारकर्मन्, the act of preparing or consecrating the materials for a sacrifice; such action, being subsidiary, does not bring about an **अपूर्व**,—144 ; this **संस्कार**, according to Badari, is one of the 3 constituents of **शेष**,—the other two being **द्रव्य** and **गुण**.

गुण (Thus संस्कारो नाम स भवति यस्मिञ्जाते पदार्थो भवति योग्यः कस्यचिदर्थस्य), 209.

संस्कारकल्पनायामप्यदृष्ट कल्पना (Quoted in Nyāyamañjari, p. 370).

संस्कार शब्द, a word used for the consecration of material; and after such consecration, according to the *pūrvapakṣa* view, तृण becomes बर्हिस, and घृत becomes आज्य but this is denied,—94—96

*संस्था, a complete liturgical course ; the 7 fundamental forms (Saṃsthā) of Soma Sacrifice. This term, meaning properly 'termination, consummation', probably applied originally to the concluding rites of the Soma sacrifice proper, as the distinctive features of the several forms of sacrifice, but by a natural transition, became the generic term for the complete forms of sacrifice'. (Eggeling's note on Śatap. iv—5. 3. 1. See, too, Kunte's note on sūtr 3. 3. 28),—303, 383.

"संस्थाप्य पौर्णमासीं वैमृधमनुनिर्वपेत्" (See T. S. 2. 4. 2. 2. 2. 5. 3. 1),—508.

"†संस्थिते संस्थितेऽहनि गृहपतिर्मृगयां याति स तत्र यान्मृगान्हन्ति तेषां तरसाः पुरोडाशाः सवनीया भवन्ति." This is connected with sacrificial session (lasting 36 years) of the Śākyas (or शाक्य);—Kunte translates it thus :—"Every evening the sacrificer goes a-hunting ; the flesh of every animal wh: he kills there constitutes the savanīya puroḍāśa cakes", 433.

सकृत्कृत्वा कृतार्थः शब्दः, 649—50.

---

*For further explanation of this term, and for the list of Seven Sacrifice, See Śatap. transn, vol. 3, p. xiii.

†*Āpast. Srauta* xxiii. 11. 12, 13. See also vol ii, p. 172 (ix. 1. 39).

सकृद्वचनेन ज्ञातस्य पुनर्वचनेन प्रयोजनम्,--538.

*"**संक्रम यज्ञेन यजेतान्नाद्यकामः**", 179. (For this **यज्ञ** see *Vaitāna Sūtra* xliii. 22, G·rbe's edn.)

"**संग्रामिणं चतुर्होत्रा याजयेत्** etc.", 484. ["Reciting the Mantras called Chaturhota, he may cause a warrior's sacrifice."—*Kunte*]

†**संज्ञप्त होम**, an oblation to be offered after killing the sacrificial animal,—772. [*Āpast Śrauta* vii, 17, 3. One would infer from this sutra, and from TS. 3.1.4. 3, that this **होम** was to be offered if the animal *raised a cry* of *pain* whilst being killed; but the com. on Āpast says :—"**संज्ञप्तिनिमित्तो होमो न तु मान्त्रवर्णिकमायुःकरणादिनिमित्तः । तेन नित्य इति ज्ञापयितुमुक्तं 'संज्ञप्ते संज्ञप्तहोममि'ति**", but this seems unreasonable.]

सत (among Mlecchas)-**दारुमयं पात्रं परिमण्डलं शतछिद्रम्**,-71.

सत्त्रन्याय,—664, 732.

सद्यस्काल, falling on the same day,—548-9, 595.

‡**सदस्य**, the 17th priest at a **सोमयज्ञ**,—405.

सन्तर्दन, 'fastening together',—301.

संध्यायां मृगा अपि न चरन्ति किं पुनर्विद्वांसो ब्राह्मणाः,—38.

सन्निकृष्टकालाः कृतका वेदाः (so an objector),—36.

"**सप्तदश प्राजापत्यान्पशूनालभते**, etc," (TB. 1. 3. 4. 3),—456, 542, 557.

"**सप्तदश वैश्यस्यानुब्रूयात्**" (?), 740.

---

*The Sūtra is **संक्रमयज्ञः** [illegible] **मत्य** ॥ "The Śrauta of the Atharvaveda is the *Vaitāna Sūtra*. It is named from the word with wh: it begins". Macdonell's Sanskrit Lit., p. 246.

† See *JRAS* 1914, pp. 305, 732.

‡So *pūrvapakṣa*, but the [illegible] is declared to be the 17th. See, however, Egg.'s note on x, 4, 1, 19.

"सप्तदश सामिधेनीरनुब्रूयात्", 369 (Ait. Br. i. 1). Cf TS. vi. 3. 7. 1.

"*सप्तदशारत्निर्वाजपेयस्य यूपो भवति",—232.

"†सप्तदशावराश्चतुर्विंशतिपरमाः सत्रमासीरन्",—634, 664; 726, 758.

"सप्तदशो वैश्यः",—740.

"सप्तमं पदं गृह्णाति",—451.

समभिव्याहृत, 'mentioned together',—161.

समभ्याशीकरण, 'bringing near',—421.

समवत्त 'cut up', divided into fragments,—345 (√दो).

समाख्या, 'name'—the names given by Âcāryas to different sets of mantras [See Kunte on sūtra 3. 8. 19],—256, 284, 420, 421.

"समावप्रच्छिन्नाग्रौ दर्भौ प्रादेशमात्रौ पवित्रे करोति",—429 [cf. Kātyā Śr. ii. 75 (p. 127)].

समानयन, conveying butter from the उपभृत to the जुहू for the 4th प्रयाज offering (see Kunte on 4. 1. 40),—460, 463—4.

"समिधो यजति तनूनपातं यजति etc. (TS. 2. 6. 1. 1). Here each यजति refers to a distinct sacrifice, and therefore has its own अपूर्व,—139, 283, 368, 440, 540, 661.

समुदायप्रसिद्धिरवयवप्रसिद्धेर्बाधिका (See *Paribhāṣendu Śekhara* xcviii, and *Mahābhāṣya*, vol i, p. 209),—752, 778.

समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः (Mahābhāṣya, vol. i, p. 41, etc),—223, 224.

"समे दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेत etc",—481.

---

*See *Sānkhāyana* Śr. xv. 1. 16. 17.

†At the least 17, at the most 24, persons ought to hold a sacrificial session (Kunte).

“**सं पत्नी पत्या सुकृतेन गच्छताम्** etc.”,—615 (TB. 3. 7. 5.11)

संभारविधान, ‘the carrying down of preparatory details’ [So Jhā in his Transn. (p. 838) of *Tantravārtika* (p. 599)],—177-8.

संमार्जनादि is a subsidiary (**गुण**) action,—115.

सयदिक, ‘having an if in it’ (a sentence),—169.

“**स यद्यगृहीतहविरभ्युदियात्** etc.”,—707.

“**सर्वतः परिहारमाश्विनं भक्षयति**,”—348-9 (TS. 6. 4. 9. 4).

सर्वपृष्ठेष्टि (TS. 2. 3. 7. 2),—347 [a sacrifice performed with all the six Samans called **पृष्ठ**,—see Eggeling, vol 3, p. xxii, and Śatap. ix 4. 3. 11. Also, see **वैराजपृष्ठ**, above].

सर्वशाखाप्रत्ययमेकं कर्म,—197—8, 200, 207, 774 (*See Maxims 111*).

“**सर्वस्मै वा एतद्यज्ञाय गृह्यते यद्ध्रुवायामाज्यम्**” (TB. 3.3.5.5),- 343, 477.

सर्वस्वं ददाति, 742, 744.

***सर्वस्वार**,-581 [Kunte renders this ‘general accentuation’, but can it be the sacrifice of that name in Jai X. 2. 56 and Lāṭy. Śrauta 8 8. 1 ?].

“**सर्वाभ्यो वा देवताभ्यः …. आत्मानमागुरते**”,—693.

“**सर्वाभ्यो वा एष देवताभ्यः … आत्मानं निष्क्रीणीते**”,—693-4.

“**सर्वे ऋत्विज उपवसन्ति**”,—416.

“**सर्वेभ्यो वा एष देवेभ्यः सर्वैभ्यश्छन्दोभ्यः** etc”. (Cf. TB. 1. 4. 7. 7),—496.

“**सर्वेषां वा एतद्देवानां रूपं यदेष ग्रहः** etc.” (TS. 3. 5. 9. 1 has **सर्वासां …. देवतानां**),—520.

---

* See note on Śatap. 8. 1. 1. 8 regarding *Svāra Sāmans.* Also *Vedic Index*—s.v. *S'unas-karṇa*, and Āpast. Śr-XXII 7·20, 21, and com. on *Tāṇḍya* XVII. 12. 1.

सवनीय पशु—In the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice there are 3 animals to be killed on three different days. The first, called Agnīṣomīya, is killed on the day preceding the sacrifice; the second, called the Savanīya, on the day of the Sutya or Soma juice extraction ; and the third called Anubandhya, on the last or *avabhṛitha* day (Jhā on Prabhākara Mīmāṃsā, p. 203),—373, 527.

सवनीयपुरोडाश—In S'atap. iv. 2. 5. 15 and 16 Eggeling renders this 'cakes of the Soma feast', 'Soma feast cakes', and, in a note to iii. 9. 3. 10, he calls them 'the five havis-oblations to be offered at the morning pressing.' At the **शाक्यायन** (q. v. above) the cakes are made of the flesh of animals killed in *hunting*.—433.

"**स वै ध्रुवामेवाभिघारयति** etc,"—388, 588.

सव्य=**रूक्ष**, 'dry' (**सव्यशब्दो रूक्षे भाष्यते**—so Śabara),—458.

"**सव्या वा एतर्हि वपा यर्हि अनभिघृता**" (Mādhava reads **शम्या वा** etc),—458.

"**स सोमेनेष्ट्वाग्नीषोमीयो भवति**",—590.

"**सहधर्मश्चरितव्यः** " (smṛti),—613.

"**सहपशूनालभते**",—432, 545.

"**सहशाखया प्रस्तरं प्रहरति**",—474, 697.

सहस्र संवत्सरं=1000 *days*,—755—61.

"**सहाऽपत्यमुत्पादयितव्यम्**",—613.

साकमेधीयन्याय,—548, 553 (**साकमेध** S'atap. ii. 5. 3 and *note* on p. 409 as to origin of name).

साकंप्रस्थायी यज्ञ,—179, 346 [T. S. 2. 5. 4. 3. Sāyaṇa, on p. 581, vol. 2, explains it as the sacrifice at wh: the Adhvaryu proceeds (**प्रस्थानं**) to the **होमस्थान**, accompanied by (**साकं**) Brāhmaṇas carrying 4 jars filled with curds and milk].

साक्षः पुरुषः परेण चेन्नीयते नूनमक्षिभ्यां न पश्यति,—55 (Quoted in *Nyāyamañjārī*, p. 286).

सांग्रहणी (इष्टि) [T. S. 2. 3. 9. 2, where Sāyaṇa explains it thus :—"**मनसा परस्परमैकमत्येन सम्यक् स्वीकारः संग्रहणम्। तद्यस्यामिष्टावस्ति सा सांग्रहणी**" ॥ See, too, Śabara x. 4. 7, and T. B. 3. 8. 1. 1]-506, 519, 656.

साद्यस्क्र, 'an *ekāha* performance of the Soma sacrifice at which the consecration, buying and pressing of soma, are compressed into one day' (Eggeling's note on iii. 5. 1. 17),—545.

सान्तपनेष्टि, an offering to the Maruts as *scorchers* (Śatap. ii. 5. 3. 3),—548, 553.

सान्नाय, a libation of sweet and sour milk offered to Indra at the New Moon sacrifice (Eggeling on Śatap. i. 6. 4. 9),—211, 295, 596, 655, 691, 697, 699, 704, 710.

साक्षेपमसमर्थम्,—241 [Mahābhāṣya 2.1.69 (vārt 6].

सामन् is a mantra *set to music*,—129.

सामानाधिकरण्य,—85.

सामान्यतो दृष्ट,—inference from generalization—one of the 3 kinds of anumāna (Nyāya Sūtra 1. 1. 5)—368.

सामि = अपरिसमाप्य, 'prematurely' (as in **साम्युत्थान** and **साम्युत्तिष्ठेरन्**)—711.

"**सामिधेनीरन्वाह**" TS. 2. 5. 8. 2),—569.

सामिधेन्यः, 'kindling verses ;—so Eggeling in Śatap. 1. 3. 5. 1 etc ; iii. 1. 3. 6 and note,—234, 369, 393, 569, 740.

साम्प्रदायिक, 'traditional',—161.

"**सायं जुहोति** etc" (TB. 2. 1. 2. 7),—554.

सायं दोह, 377.

"**सारस्वतौ भवतः** etc" (TS. 2. 4. 6, 1),—545.

सार्वभौम,—743.
सावित्र होमाः (Śatap. vi. 3. 1),—566.
"सावित्राणि होष्यन्तः सन्निवपेरन्",—738.
"साहस्रं प्रथमं चिन्वानः etc" 491 (TS. 5. 6. 8. 2).

सिंह, applied figuratively to a violent man (प्रसह्यकारितया),—682.

सुत्याकाल, the time of the extraction of the Soma juice,—432.

"सुवर्णं हिरण्यं भार्यम्" (TB. 2. 3. 4. 6),—326.
"सुवाससा भवितव्यम्",—326.
सूक्तवाकन्याय,—254.
सूक्तवाकनिगद,—292.
"सूक्तवाकेन प्रस्तरं प्रहरति" (See Eggeling on 1. 8. 3. 10, and translation of 2. 5. 2. 42),—252, 254, 293, 639. See Āpast. 3. 6. 6.

सृष्टीरूपदधाति (TS. 5. 3. 4 7)—104 (सृष्टि is the name given to each of the bricks forming the 4 ṇ layer of the sacrificial altar, S'atap. VIII. 4. 3. 1).

"सोत्रे जुहोति अग्नये स्वाहा etc" (TB. 3. 1. 4. 1),—565.
सोपानत्के पादे etc,—56.

सोमक्रयणी, the cow with wh: soma is bought (S'atap. 3. 3. 1. 13),—451.

"सोमं क्रीणाति",—771.
"सोमपो न द्वितीयां जायामभ्यषूयते",—768.

सोमवाजिन् (Śat. xii. 7. 2. 2; Kātyāyana Śrauta xix. 2),—333.

सोमशब्दः क्षीरिण्यां लतायां प्रसिद्धो न रसे,—151.

"सोमस्याग्ने वीहीत्यनुवषट् करोति" (Ait. Br. 3. 1. 5),—273, 344.

"सोमारौद्रं घृते चरुं निर्वपेत्" (T. S. 2. 2. 10. 1 without घृते. See, too, Śat. V. 3. 2. 1),—483.

"सोमेन यजेत" (T. S. 2. 5. 6. 1),—651.

"सोमो नानुपहूतेन पेयः",—358 (cf. Śat. 1. 6. 3. 7).

"सोऽरोदीद्यदरोदीत्तद्रुद्रस्य रुद्रत्वम्",—39 (T. S. 1. 5. 1. 1).

सौत्रामाण ["an इष्टि the object of wh: is to make amends for any excess committed in the consumption of soma liquor".—Eggeling, vol iii, p, xxvi, and Śatap. v, 5. 4],—346, 507.

सौधन्वनाः (=रथकाराः),—632.

"सौधन्वना ऋभवः etc" (RV, i. 110. 4),—632.

सौभर, N. of a saman to be sung by one desiring rain,—165-7.

"सौमापौष्णं चरुं निर्वपेन्नेमपिष्टं पशुकामः",—308.

"सौमेन्द्रं चरुं निवपेत् श्यामाकं सोमवामिनः" (cf. TS. 9. 3. 2. 6),--333.

सौम्यस्याध्वरस्य यज्ञक्रतोः सप्तदश ऋत्विजः",—402.

"सौर्यं चरुं निर्वपेद्ब्रह्मवर्चसकामः" (Cf. TS. 2. 3. 2. 3),—181, 502, 506, 656.

सौविष्टकृत, relating to, belonging to, the स्विष्टकृत् fire, -561.

स्कन्न (√स्कन्द), 'spilt' as milk),—650, 677—8, 719 (See भिन्ने जुहोति).

स्तुतशस्त्रयोः (2. 1. 13). Mādhava explains thus—"अप्रगीतमन्त्रसाध्या स्तुतिः शस्त्रम्। प्रगीतमन्त्रसाध्या स्तुतिः स्तोत्रम्". See, too, X. 4. 49.

स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ तृचौ भवतः etc," 571—2 (see note to Śātap. 8, 1, 3, 4. The तृच is a strophe consisting of 3 verses).

स्तोम, a kind of chant,—535.

स्तोमभाग, certain mantras repeated at the laying of bricks for a soma sacrifice. (See TS, 3, 5, 2, 1 and com; also 4, 4, 1 and Lāṭ. *Ś*r. 5, 11, 1 etc. In *Śātap.* 8, 5, 3, 1 Eggeling renders "He then lays down the Stomabhāgā". Here, then, it is an epithet of the bricks)—736.

स्त्रीगौः सोमक्रयणी,—446—7(Âpast. xxii. 4. 6).

स्थपतीष्टि,—766, 768.

"**स्थविमतो वर्हिरक्ताऽपास्यति** ",—453 (T. S. 6. 3. 9. 2).

स्थानक्रम, the sequence of 'position' or right place in a series,—537.

स्फ्य, "a straight sword or knife, a cubit long, carved out of khadira wood. It is used for various purposes calculated to symbolically insure the safe and undisturbed performance of the sacrifice" (Eggeling's note on Śatap. 1. 1. 2. 8. See, too, his translation of 1 8. 3. 26),—213.

"**स्फ्यश्च कपालानि च** etc",—213, 441 (T. S. 1. 6. 8. 3).

"**स्फ्येनाद्धन्ति** etc." (T. S. 6. 6. 4. 1),—442.

"**स्योनं ते सदनं कृणोमि** etc."—133, 290 (T. B. 3. 7. 5. 2).

"**स्रजमुद्गात्रे ददाति**" (TS. 1. 8. 18. 1),—478.

स्रुग्धारणे विनियुक्तस्य प्रस्तरस्य प्रहरणं प्रतिपत्तिः ",—253.

"**स्रुचः संमार्ष्टि**",—115.

"**स्रुचः संमृड्ढि**",—423.

"**स्रुवेणावद्यति** etc", 106.

"**स्वधिति**, 'an axe' (See *Vedic Index*),—528.

"**स्वयं निगद्य यजति**",—361.

स्वरु,—the first chip cut from the tree which is felled for **यूप**, or sacrificial post, and eventually thrown into the fire instead of the latter (Śatap. iii. 6. 4. 11 and iii. 7. 1. 24. 30),—466—9, 528.

*"**स्वरुणा पशुमनक्ति** etc.",—466, 529 ; 528 inserts **स्वधितिना च** after **स्वरुणा.**

"**स्वरुर्यूपाङ्गमिति चेत्**" (1st pāda of a S'loka),—529.

स्वर्ग, defined as **प्रीति** or 'secular happiness' (Kunte), is the fruit of any sacrificial act for which no other reward is promised,—500 ; defined as any pleasure-giving thing, e. g. silk garments, *chandana*, a girl of 16 etc,—599 ; also as the *absence* of heat, cold, pain etc,—600.

स्ववन्त्, 'possessing property', wealthy,—612, 614—15.

स्वस्थानादावृत्तिः, 'repetition (of each) from its own place', in contradistinction to **दण्डकलितवत्** (see *JRAS* for 1912, p. 745),—569.

स्वस्वामिसम्बन्ध,—309.

स्विष्टकृत्,—675.

हविरभिवासन, 'covering the offering (with ashes)',—553.

हविर्धान, "a temporary shed or tent erected on the sacrificial ground for the performance of the soma sacrifices in wh: the two carts containing the soma plants are placed" (note to S'atap. 1. 1. 2. 9. See too iii. 5. 3). It is from this shed that processions apppear to start, each one holding the end of the cloth worn by the one in front of him, and for the dropping of which certain penalties are prescribed. (See above under **अपच्छेद** and the nyāya in *Maxims* iii),—393—5,427.

"**हविर्धाने चर्मन्नधि ग्रावभिरभिषुत्य** etc". (TS. 6. 2. 11. 4),—355—6, 688.

---

*Cf. Āpast vii. 14. 11, 12,

II.—SOME ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF THE NATHAS.

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

Introduction.

A detailed and systematic history of Indian Culture remains yet to be written. But there is hardly any doubt that before it can be successfully undertaken continued spade-work is necessary in various fields of study. The cultural history of a people is no less complex than its political one, and it becomes all the more so when it extends through long centuries and represents the outcome of diverse currents and cross-currents of forces.

The study of Nātha and Siddha sects is a preliminary to a thorough study of mediaeval Indian Thought. Even this study has its different aspects. The present paper, which sums up some of the main points on the subject, is therefore meant to be no more than a suggestive one. And it may be hoped that the subject will be taken up for investigation and an attempt will be made to throw light on the many obscure issues involved.

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī drew the attention of scholars to the literature of the so-called Buddhist Siddhāchāryas. That many of the āchāryas were identical with the Nāthas, who were known as Siddhas, is indeed a fact. But their exact position is not known. The history of Tantrik Literature, specially that of the Tripurā section, abounds in the names of Nāthas. Many of these names are of course not proper or historical names at all, but only of certain abstract principles. But some are indeed historical. After initiation the disciple is given there a name ending in

'Nātha'. It is needless to say that we have no concern here with these 'Nāthas'. A regular and systematic study of the teachings of the Haṭha Yogins—the Nāthas proper, e.g., Matsyendra Nātha, Gorakṣanātha, etc.,—of the Vajrayāna and Sahajayāna Buddhists, of the Tantrists of Tripurā order and also of the Vīrāchāra cult, of the followers of Dattātreya, of the Śaivas, of the later Sahajiyās and the neo-Vaiṣṇavas, will reveal several features in common. The relation between Mahāyāna Buddhism and Tantric culture is an important one and deserves close and careful examination. It would be of great interest to find out how the Śūnyavāda of Mahāyāna has crept into Haṭha Yoga, Tantra, etc. and how ultimately this Śūnya has come to be interpreted in the way it has been done in the later Buddhist Schools. All these Schools of Thought being allied to the philosophical position of the Alchemists the science of Alchemy as it used to be cultivated in Ancient India has also to be studied. The Rasavāda of the neo-Vaiṣṇavas owes much to the development of the mystic Science associated with the names of the Siddhas.

The scope of the present paper is not however so wide. It is an humble attempt to present in a very few words, mainly on the basis of Mss. and of printed books, a sketch of the doctrines of the Nāthas, together with a short note on the origin of the sect and on the bibliography of its literature.

ORIGIN OF THE SECT.

As usual in this country the Nātha sect claims a divine origin. Brahmānanda*, in his commentary, called Jyotsnā, on the Haṭhayogapradīpikā (1.5), clearly states that Ādiṇāthā, or Śiva was the first of all the Nāthas and that according to a tradition preserved in Nāthist literature the sect was founded by Śiva:

---

* The date of Brahmānanda is not known. But as he refers to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in his commentary on the Haṭha Yoga Pradīpikā (1.4), he must have lived in the beginning of the 18th century or even later.

आदिनाथः शिवः सर्वेषां नाथानां प्रथमो नाथः । (ततो) नाथसम्प्रदायः प्रवृत्त इति नाथसम्प्रदायिनो वदन्ति ।

From the above extract it would appear that the Sect was known by the name of Nātha-panth. Scholars too generally use this very term in referring to the sect. But in literature it is also known as Siddhamārga, Avadhūta mārga, etc., and as the teachers of this School lay a great emphasis on the practice of Yoga for the attainment of perfection it has come to be designated as 'Yogamārga' par excellence. The Kāpālika sect is in some minor respects closely allied to it, but it is a distinct path altogether; and though its origin is attributed to Ādinātha, its main teachings and practices have a character of their own.

The Śabara Tantra gives a list of twenty-four Kāpālikas—12 teachers and 12 pupils. It is interesting to find that some of these names, especially those of the pupils, are those of the well-known Nāthas or Siddhas. The names of the twelve teachers, for instance, are—(1) Ādinātha, (2) Anādinātha, (3) Kālanātha, (4) Atikālanātha, (5) Karālanātha, (6) Vikarālanātha, (7) Mahākālanātha, (8) Kāla Bhairavanātha, (9) Baṭukanātha, (10) Bhūtanātha, (11) Vīranātha and (12) Śrīkaṇṭhanātha. The names of their twelve pupils appear in this order: (1) Nāgārjuna, (2) Jaḍa Bharata, (3) Haris'chandra, (4) Satyanātha, (5) Bhīmanātha, (6) Gorakṣanātha, (7) Charpaṭanātha, (8) Avadyanātha, (9) Vairāgyanātha, (10) Kanthādhārī, (11) Jalandhara and (12) Malayārjuna.

Though the spiritual descent of the sect is said to be from the Divine source its historical foundation is ascribed to one Matsyendra Nātha. The life history of this great man is so intimately woven up with legends that it is very difficult to make a proper discrimination. It is said that Matsyendra had originally been a fish who overheard the secret Yoga-instructions of Ādinatha or Śiva and become fixed in body and mind (तीरसमीपनीरस्थः कश्चन मत्स्यः तं योगोपदेशं श्रुत्वा एकाग्रचित्तो निश्चलकायोऽवतस्थे). When the fact was noticed by the great Lord, He came to know what the steadiness meant and out of compassion sprinkled water on his body. The result was that the fish was immediately transfigured and his form was converted into a human body of celestial type—thenceforward famous as the Siddha Matsyendranātha. Mm. H. P. Śāstri is of opinion that the real name of Matsyendra was Machchhaghna, which probably means 'a fisherman.' Be that as it may, there is no doubt that Matsyendra was a Yogin of high order. It is said that inspite of his great powers he fell a victim to the snares of passion and that it was with much difficulty that Gorakṣa, his most favourite disciple, succeeded in reclaiming him.

He had several disciples. Besides Gorakṣa, who became the most renowned of the batch, there were Chauraṅgī, Ghorācholi and others. There are legends associated with each and every Siddha. And almost every Siddha is credited with the composition of certain musical verses which used to be sung in the middle ages and continue to be recited even now to the tune of an one-stringed instrument by pedestrian minstrel-beggars in the street.

In the literature of the Nāthas one very often comes across the name Mīnanātha. It is hard to say whether this was a synonym of Matsyendra. The two names were believed by many to refer to the same person. But in the list of Nāthas furnished by Brahmānanda we find the name of Mīna mentioned separately from that of Matsyendra (on H. Yo. Pr. 1. 5—9). Mm. H. P. Śāstrī speaks of them as if they were two persons and says that both of them were natives of Chandradvīpa.

The word Chauraṅgī (= Sk. Chaturaṅgī) means a person shorn of hands and legs. It is said that while Matsyendra, after he had become a Siddha through the grace of Ādinātha, was roaming at will through the world he came across Chauraṅgī in a certain forest and took pity on him. Chauraṅgī's body, which was only a trunk, became furnished in a mysterious way with hands and legs, whereupon he fell at the feet of the great Siddha, asked for his Grace and obtained it. He became a Siddha, known as Chauraṅgī Nātha. The following saying is attributed to him.

Ghorācholī was another disciple of Matsyendra.

But the greatest of Matsyendra's disciples—indeed one of the greatest souls India has ever produced—was certainly Gorakṣa Nātha. He was a great Siddha, was the father of Haṭha Yoga in its current form and was the great apostle of Yogīc mysticism in the mediaeval ages. In the Pañchamātrāyoga, attributed to himself, it is stated that during the period of his discipleship he passed twelve long years in watchfulness on the cremation ground. Mm. H.P. Śāstrī says, on the strength of Tārānātha's evidence, that Gorakṣa was originally a Buddhist and that he became a Nātha only in his later years. As a Buddhist he was known by the name of Anaṅga Vajra (according to Tārānātha, but Ramaṇa Vajra according to Mm. Śāstrî). This may be true. But in the Kāyabodha, attributed to Gorakṣa Nātha himself, there is a saying which would seem to show that he had been in all probability originally a slayer of animals (पश्वारम्भक). If the word *Ārambha* means sacrifical slaughter, as it often does, Gorakṣa cannot be described to have been a Buddhist before his conversion into Nāthism. But as it is a mere conjecture the point need not be pressed far.

The age of Gorakṣa or of his Guru Matsyendra is not known with certainty. The tradition connecting him with Kabir (1500 A. D.) and with Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (1700 A. D.) is not probably of any historical value. But Jñāna Nātha *alias* Jñāna Deva, who is usually assigned to the thirteenth century, mentions his own spiritual pedigree, in his commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā in which Gorakṣa Nātha appears as his third predecessor,—thus: Ādinatha, Matsyendra Nātha, Gorakṣa Nātha, Gahinī Nātha, Nivṛtti Nātha and Jñāna Nātha. This would place Gorakṣa in the beginning of the 12th Century A D. This date agrees with the tradition which makes Gorakṣa and Dharmanātha contemporaries and pupils of the same Guru. Dharmanātha is generally assigned to the 12th Centuary A. D. But there are other views according to which Gorakṣa lived in 500 A. D. or 700 A. D. or 1000 A. D. The disciples of Gorakṣa were numerous, some of whom attained to distinction. We read of Bāla Nātha, Hālika Pāva, Māli Pava, etc. as being his disciples. Mayanāmatī, the queen mother of Rājā Gopīchānd, is also said to have been initiated by Gorakṣa.

This Bāla Nātha may be the same as the Siddha Bālapāda of whom we find an account in the Tibetan literature and who is identified with the great Jalandhara Nātha. He had probably been a Śūdra, but became a Buddhist afterwards and finally a convert to Nāthism. He was a powerful saint. In Bengal he was popularly known as Hāḍipā. His greatness was universally acknowledged, some assigning to him a higher place, owing to his extraordinary sanctity, than Gorakṣa Nātha himself.* We can glean some account of this Saint from Nirañjana Purāṇa. It is said that in the neighbourhood of Kerali he showed Grace to one Śabala, who wrote certain *dohās* or verses in memory of his guru and of his own conversion. His achievements were many and varied. Among the persons on whom he condescended to confer Grace there was many an illustrious figure. Rājā Gopī Chānd of Bengal, Rājā Bhartṛhari of Ujjein and Charpaṭa*, who is described as the maternal uncle of Gopī Chānd, were among his disciples. The names of some of his other disciples are Gogā†, Chaṭikānātha, Rāma Sinha ‡, Bhīma §, the merchant Agila, the merchant Sandhara (in Palanpur), etc. He is said to have practised penances on a mountain, called Rakta, in the City (आदिपुरी) of Daṇḍavatī. Many of his Yogic feats are recounted. For instance he caused pearls to be miraculously produced in the Yugandhara field ; he turned a person, named Kānha, born dumb (जन्म मूक), into an eloquent Poet ; he exhibited the whole Universe in a clear vision to king Reṇuka on mount Kāñchana and gave him a wonderful sword; he conferred a boon on a gentleman of the Raghu family which enabled him to subdue the superior forces of the Emperor single-handed and granted a lovely son to a Chāraṇa named Dala. There are many other stories of this kind. It is related that once Jalandhara went to the borders of a village (named Śeṣāli) and lit his dhooni (अग्निधानी) there, when a prince came to meet him. Jalandhara was pleased to present him with an excellent sword, called Rāma Chandra, with which the prince fought and killed several Yavanas—including those of 'Joya' (?) class, one of whom had assassinated his father. Thereupon some Bhāṭis, a clan of the Yādavas, challenged him in battle and pressed him hard. The prince remembered Jalandhara in the battlefield, on which the latter appeared before him at once. The sword was immediately lengthened into an enormous size and the opponents were beaten back. Having won the battle the prince himself disappeared and became immortal.

---

*Cf. Jalandhara stotra attributed to S'abala.

---

* In the 'Ananta Vākya' attributed to Charpaṭa, he is called a 'Rājā' ('तत्वं सत्वं वदति चर्पटो राजेति'), that is, a prince of royal heritage. In the 'Mahā Santa Vākya' Mayanāmatī calls him her brother.

† About Gogā several traditions are in existence vz. (1) He was the son of a Chauhan King of Bagar in Rajputana—born by the grace of Gorakṣa Nātha ; (2) he lived about 1150 A.D. ; (3) he was a contemporary of Prithvī Rāj Chauhan ; (4) he was a great warrior and was killed with his son in a battle with Mahmud of Ghazni in 1024 A.D.

‡ Rāma Siṃha was of "Gauḍajāti" !. Jalandhara showed him Grace on the bank of the river "Kāliya".

§ It is said that Jalandhara showed special favour to Bhīma and transmitted to him all the Yogic Powers (ऋद्धय:) at once. The name of one Bhīma occurs on the list of Siddhas furnished in the Varṇanaratnākara.

Gopīchānd, the son of Rājā Triloka chandra * of Bengal, became the disciple of Jalandhara Nātha and left his kingdom at the instance of his saintly mother Mayanāmatī. The Mahāsanta Vākya contains a short account of his renunciation The language in which the queen mother exhorted her reluctant son on the vanity of the world and its possessions and on the supreme necessity of taking recourse to a Spiritual Teacher for enlightenment is unrivalled. Seldom in human history has a mother been found to take the initiative in sending her own son away in quest of saving Wisdom—a quest fraught with immense perils and possibility of untold sufferings. The story

---

* This name appears in the Mahā Santa Vākya, as well as in Marathi traditions. In the Hindi version of the story Triloka chandra has been corrupted into Tilaka chand. In some early Bengali works the name occurs as Trailokya Chandra.

of Gopīchānd's renunciation has become classical, and almost every vernacular of northern India has got its own versions of it. Gopīchānd, as a Siddha, came to be known as Śṛngārī Pāva. In the Siddhānta Vākya there is an interesting dialogue between him and Jalandhara. The former puts to Jalandhara a series of questions, to which the latter replies. The questions are thus worded :

गोपीचन्दः कथयति—
भो स्वामिन् पृच्छामि कथय अन्तर्यामिन्—
वसतौ स्थीयते तदा कन्दर्पो व्याप्नुते ॥
वने स्थीयते तदा क्षुत् सन्तापयति ।
आसने स्थीयते तदा स्पृशति माया
पथि गम्यते तदा छिद्यते कायः ।
मिष्टं भद्यते तदा वर्धते रोगः
कथयं कथं साध्यते योगः ।

Jalandhara answers—

श्रोतव्योऽवधुत तत्त्वस्य विचारः
यः एष सकलशिरोमणिः सारः ।
संयत आहारे कन्दर्पो न व्याप्नुते
वाह्यारम्भे क्षुन्न सन्तापयति
सिद्ध आसने नहिस्पृशति माया
बाद् प्रमाणेन छिद्यते कायः ।
जिह्वायाः सुखाय न कर्त्तव्यो भोगः
मनः पवनौ च गृहीत्वा साधनीयो योगः ॥

He further adds—

अल्पमश्नाति स तु कल्पयति जल्पति
बहु भुनक्ति स तु रोगी ।
द्वयोरपि पत्तयोर्यः संधिं विचारयति
स तु कोऽपि विरलो योगी ॥

The last couplet contains the quintessence of the Nāthic teachings.

The story of Bhartṛhari, another prince of royal blood, is equally interesting. He too renounced the joys and luxuries of the palace and under the guidance of Jalandhara attained to perfection in Yoga. In the literature of the Siddhas his name appears as Vichāra Nātha.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE NĀTHAS.

In the Siddhānta Vākya of Jalandhara we read—

वन्दे तन्नाथतेजो भुवनतिमिरहं भानुतेजस्करं वा
सत्कर्तृव्यापकं त्वा पवनगतिकरं व्योमवन्निर्भरं वा ।
मुद्रानादत्रिशूलैर्विमलरुचिधरं खर्परं भस्ममिश्रं
द्वैतं वाऽद्वैतरूपं द्वयत उत परं योगिनां शङ्करं वा ॥

This shows that the metaphysical position of the Nāthas was not monistic, nor was it dualistic either. It was transcendental in the truest sense of the term. They speak of the Nātha, the Absolute, as beyond the opposition involved in the concepts of Saguṇa and Nirguṇa or of Sākāra and Nirākāra And so to them the Supreme End of Life is to realise oneself as Nātha and to remain eternally fixed above the world of relations. The way to this realisation is stated to be Yoga, on which they lay great emphasis. It is held that Perfection can not be attained by any means unless it is supplemented by the disciplinary practices of Yoga. The Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati, attributed sometimes to Gorakṣa Nātha and sometimes to Nitya Nātha, goes further and says :

सन्मार्गंश्च योगमार्गः, तदितरस्तु पाषण्डमार्गः[*] ।

But what is Yoga ? It is explained in different works in different ways. But in whatever way it is explained the central conception remains the same. It is what since then has come to be known as Haṭha—a term which is thus interpreted in the Siddhasiddhānta paddhati—

---

[*] Ādinātha : योगमार्गात् परो मार्गो नास्ति नास्ति श्रुतौ स्मृतौ; Vivekamārtaṇḍa : योगशास्त्रं पठेन्नित्यं किमन्यैः शास्त्रविस्तर :; etc.

हकारः कीर्त्तितः सूर्यष्ठकारश्चन्द्र उच्यते ।
सूर्याचन्द्रमसोर्योगाद्‌ हठयोगो निगद्यते ॥

According to Brahmānanda the Sun and the Moon stand here for Prāṇa and Apāna, and their union is Prāṇāyama, which is therefore the meaning of Haṭhayoga. The conquest of Vāyu is thus the essence of Haṭhayoga.

It is believed that this kind of Yoga was introduced in India by the Nāthas. The Haṭha yoga pradipikā (I. 4) says that the mystery of this Yoga was known only to Matsyendra Nātha and Gorakṣa Nātha. Brahmānanda adds the names of Jālandhara, Bhartṛhari and Gopi Chānd. It is of interest to note that all these persons were associated with the Nāth panth. Hence it seems likely that Gorakṣa, or more probably Matsyendra, was the earliest preacher of Haṭha Yoga.[*] This need not be inconsistent with the statement—श्रीआदिनाथाय नमोऽस्तु तस्मै येनोपदिष्टा हठयोगविद्या (H. Yo. Pr. 1–1)–,[†] because every Vidyā may be said to emanate in a sense from the Supreme Lord.[‡]

It is hard to ascertain how far the tradition ascribing to the Nāthas the foundation of Haṭha Yoga as a science is true. For there is a rival tradition which speaks of two schools of Haṭha, one ancient and the other modern, founded by Mārkaṇḍeya and the Nāthas respectively :

---

[*] It may be remembered in this connection that some of the Haṭha practices are associated with the names of certain historical persons of this school, e. g. Masytendrāsana, Padmāsana approved (accordiug to Brahmānanda) by Matsyendra, etc. with Matsyendra ; the Jālandhara bandha with Jālandhara Nātha, and so forth.

[†] Ādinātha taught this Vidyā to Pārvatī, as described in the Mahākala Yoga S'āstra and other works,–"गिरिजायै आदिनाथकृतो हठविद्योपदेशो महाकालयोगशास्त्रादौ प्रसिद्धः" (ज्योत्स्ना)

[‡] Cf. Yogī Yājñavalkya : हिरण्यगर्भो योगस्य वक्ता नान्यः पुरातनः, where Rāja Yoga is attributed to Hiraṇyagarbha.

द्विधा हठः स्यादेकस्तु गोरक्षादिसुसाधितः ।
अन्यो मृकण्डुपुत्राद्यैः साधितो हठसंज्ञकः ॥*

If this tradition has any historical basis it means that the Nāthas simply revived an ancient and dying science. And this seems to be the more plausible view to take.

But what was the need of reviving this Yoga at all, when Rāja Yoga was already in a flourishing condition? That the Haṭha Yoga, even in its higher and perfected forms, is only an ancillary, nay a stepping stone, to Rājayoga, is admitted by the Siddhas themselves. Patañjali's system is mainly based on Rāja Yoga principles; so are the Buddhist and Jain systems, though in all these the utility of simple Haṭha practices has also been recognised.

The Haṭha Yogins are of opinion that for ordinary people who have very little control over their mind the practice of Rāja Yoga is simply impossible. Mantra Yoga and the practices of meditations are indeed capable, if properly resorted to, of leading to the perfection of Rāja Yoga; but these too require the exercise of mental concentration to be of any efficacy at all—an exercise which is beyond the power of the average man. Haṭha Yoga, however, which consists in certain mechanical devices of the physical character is the only form of scientific yoga which can be useful in such circumstances. For it does not presuppose the possession of mental strength which every other class of yoga more or less implies. We have already said that the essence of Haṭha lies in the conquest of Vāyu. It is an article of universal acceptance in this country that Bindu (essence of the physical body in the form of Vīrya, Śukra, or seminal fluid), Vāyu (the

---

* The School of Mārkaṇḍeya recognised eight aṅgas of Yoga, but the latter school eliminated Yama and Niyama from Yogāṅga proper and reduced the number to six.

BVBSSMV

144

intra-organic vital currents) and Manas (mind or the principle of thinking) are closely related to one another, so that by restraining any one of them the remaining two may be easily held in check. The restraint of Bindu, as accomplished by the practice of successful Brahmacharya, being already assumed, the Haṭha yogins direct the control of Vāyu as a preliminary, or rather a means, to the realisation of mental quiescence which is the ultimate aim of all strivings. But to facilitate this restraint of Vāyu or Prāṇāyama they recommend the employment of a few other practices, viz. (1) Āsana, (2) Mudrā and (3) Nādānusandhāna.* The continued practice of Āsana is of great help in securing the lightness, health and steadiness of the body. These qualities, once attained, naturally react upon the mind. The practice of Mudrā is intended to rouse the dormant Kuṇḍalini Śakti without whose active guidance no spiritual realisation is possible. And the practice of Nāda audition acts directly upon the mind and tends to destroy its inherent restlessness. As soon as the mind is rendered inactive and the Vāyu is absorbed in the Brahmarandhra there arises the resplendent glory of Beatific State, technically known as Laya or Manonmanī or Sahajāvasthā. It is a state of intense Joy. It is to be observed in this connection that all these practices are inter-connected. The practice of Nāda can be properly started only when the Inner Sound, which is in a sense a perpetual current running through the heart of sensible Nature, comes to be an object of hearing. And this sound can be heard as a matter of course after the Vāyu has entered into the Suṣumnā Nāḍī and its various branches rendered free from the impurities accumulated there for ages. When the Nāḍīs are purified the Anāhata Sound becomes audible at once. But this purification requires the exercise of Āsana and Mudrā. On the contrary, the perfection of Asana is impossible until and unless the subtle causes which operate as deterrents upon the stability of the body are thoroughly removed. The awakening of Kuṇḍalinī which is the immediate aim of the practice of Mudrās and indeed of many other practices—is really bound up with the success, more or less complete, of Āsana. In fact, all these mechanical devices have one end to fulfil, viz. to release and set in operation the Divine Power lying asleep under the burden of Matter within Man and to render clear its path of movement. This path is now blocked up.

---

* The four aspects of Haṭha Yoga are—(a) Āsana, (b) Kumbhaka or Prāṇāyama, (c) Mudrā and (d) Nādānusandhāna: “आसनं कुम्भकं चित्रं मुद्राख्यं करणं तथा । अथ नादानुसन्धानम्” । Pratyāhāra, Dhāraṇā, Dhyāna and Samādhi, as enunciated in Yoga treatises, would come under the fourth head.

The peculiarity of the Yoga which the Nāthas taught consisted in the emphasis which it placed on the physical side of the discipline. It presupposes a thorough knowledge of the body, with its nervous and vital apparatus. The general principle on which they proceeded appears to be the recognition of the graded character of Matter, ranging from the densest form revealed in our waking sense-experience up to the most rarefied and tenuous form to which the end of Samprajñāta Samādhi—the so-called Sāsmita Samādhi—eventually leads. I am speaking here in terms of Sāṅkhya nomenclature. The consciousness of the individual self as enmeshed in grosser matter is really identical with the Universal Consciousness of the World-soul—nay, with Absolute Consciousness itself. Only that limitations have to be carefully removed. The Haṭha Yogins are of opinion that the only surest and quickest way of transcending the limitations is to rise up, rather to raise up the Vāyu, from one plane to another until the Universal Stuff is reached in the Spirit-Matter of the Highest Plane manifesting itself in the so-called Thousand-petalled Lotus (सहस्रदलकमल). These limitations are the products of stress and strain caused by the Creative Impulse of the Supreme Lord in Matter.

To speak more clearly. The pure soul, which is a mode of the Absolute and ultimately consubstantial with it, becomes enveloped in its mundane stage with a double coating of *Manas* and *Bhūtas*, representing two aspects of subtle matter. The word *Manas* is used here in a very wide sense, including buddhi, ahankāra, etc. The senses which develope later and are only the functional variations of *Manas* are also implied in it. The word *Bhūta* stands here for the objective stuff in a state of relative equilibrium. It holds within it the so-called tanmātrās, viz. śabda, sparśa, rūpa, rasa and gandha, which are not yet distinguishable as such. Each of the five mātrās has its own centre, wherein it is capable of expanding and contracting. The soul in its descending or outgoing course takes upon itself as a matter of necessity these layers of subtle matter. Though its innate purity is marred thereby it still retains enough of self-consciousness and the consequent powers. Total self-forgetfulness takes place only when it emerges into the outer world of gross matter which is the outcome of a combination, by means of a process known as Pañchikarana, of the finer radiating particles shooting out of the tanmātric centres. The descent into subtle Matter was, as it were, in a straight line, but birth into the external world is the product of an oblique motion (तिर्यग्‌गति) in Vāyu. As soon as Consciousness finds itself encased in sensible or gross matter, the *Manas* developes into senses which begin to operate each in its own line with reference to a corresponding aspect of this Matter. It is for this reason that senses cannot apprehend anything beyond dense Matter. The *Manas*, as abstracted from the senses, is indeed capable of giving rise to supersensible knowledge.

The greater the abstraction the purer the quality of this knowledge. The abstraction of *Manas* is really synonymous with its concentration and consequent purification. The so-called *Divyachakṣu*, the Celestial Eye or the Third Eye of Śiva is nothing but this purified and concentrated Mind: **मनो ह्येवात्र दैवं चक्षुः**[*]। The *Manas* as coated with dense Matter may be described as dense or sense-bound. And in this state the Vāyu too is no longer rectilinear in its motion. Every form of Vāyu with which we are familiar in our sensible experience is of this type.

This oblique motion of Vāyu in our physical body necessitates the existence of tracks of an oblique character. This is what is technically known as Nāḍīchakra consisting of numerous Nāḍīs ramifying in different directions. Leaving out the Suṣumṇā which is the central track of the straight motion of refined Vāyu, the other Nāḍīs may be loosely classed under two heads, Right and Left, from their position in relation to the Suṣumṇā. The Manas and Vāyu of an ordinary man in his senses move along these winding tracks. This movement is his Saṁsāra—his Vyutthāna.

The Nāthas insist that if the Absolute is to be reached the central Track, which leads directly into it as a river loses itself in the ocean, must be found out and resorted to. All other ways will mislead, as leading to the different planes of material existence, because they contain sediment of gross matter. As soon as the divergent currents of physical Manas,—the vṛttis of the senses, and of the physical Vāyu i.e. the functions of the vital Principle, are brought to a point with a certain degree of intensity, there flashes forth a bright light representing the expression of the concentrated śaktis of the soul. This expression of Śakti is the revelation of Kuṇḍalinī and its partial release from the obscuration of Matter. The Śakti as thus released, however partially it may be, rises up spontaneously and disappears in the Infinity of the Absolute. This disappearance does not mean annihilation: it simply means absorption and unification. The Absolute, as conceived in terms of Śakti, is the Infinity of Śakti actualised. Śakti is a Unity, whether manifest or otherwise. Brahman is nothing but the eternally manifest Śakti, which as such is only a synonym of Śiva. It is free from action and from every tinge of Matter. But it is a fact that a portion of this Śakti is swallowed up by Matter and appears to lose its identity under the pressure of the latter. The Nāthas claim that the Sad-guru, the true Spiritual Teacher, alone is able by virtue of his active Śakti, which is indeed nothing but Śiva at work, to call forth the slumbering Śakti of the disciple. The difference between Śiva and Śakti is really a difference without any distinction. It is said—

---

[*] Read in this connection the paper on "The Doctrine of Pratibhā in Indian Philosophy" by the present writer in the 'Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute,' Poona.

शिवस्याभ्यन्तरे शक्तिः शक्तेरभ्यन्तरे शिवः ।
अन्तरं नैव पश्यामि चन्द्रचन्द्रिकयोरिव ॥

(Siddhasiddhānta saṅgraha, IV. 37)

It is an inscrutable mystery how Śakti can at all be veiled by Matter. It is, nevertheless, true that once it is released it is drawn into the Infinite and universal Source which is actually free.

It is Matter that seems to divide Śiva and Śakti, so that as soon as Matter is transcended this apparent division also vanishes. And what is Matter itself? It is a phantasm appearing from the self-alienation of the Absolute as Śiva and Śakti. Naturally, therefore, when Śiva and Śakti are united this phantasm vanishes into nothing. We shall see that the aim of Yoga is the establishment of this Union. This will also explain the existence of so much erotic imagery in connection with an account of this matter in the Tantric and Nathic literature, both Hindu and Buddhistic, in the mediaeval ages.

The point is that the soul cannot know Śiva, *i.e.* cannot gain self-realisation, so long as it is bound by matter, which it can do only when its Śakti becomes free. The obscuration of Śakti means (i) its loss of connection with Śiva from which it emanated, (ii) its consequent engulfment within the dark womb of Primary Matter and (iii) its final emergence into the dense world of evanascent light which is produced from Primary Matter. The first and second moments may be successive in time or only in logical sequence. In any case it represents the so-called **प्रकृतिलीन** stage of the Yoga literature. The taint of Cosmic Nescience is the characteristic of this stage which precedes the subsequent evolution. The physical state of bondage, the third stadium in the present scheme, is characterised by a disturbance of the relative equilibrium of the forces. By way of illustration it may be pointed out that the Vāyu in the physical body is working unequally—so are the other forces.

It is therefore enjoined that this inequality has to be removed. In natural course also it is removed, though only for a moment, from time to time. This is called the Sandhikṣaṇa, corresponding to the Nirodhakṣaṇa of the earlier literature. What is necessary is to increase the duration of this kṣaṇa. It has already been shown that the Vital and other currents working within the system may be brought under a twofold head—one flowing along the right course and the other along the left. The two currents are opposite being positive and negative, and are supplementary to each other. In the literature of the Siddhas and Nāthas they are known as the Solar and the Lunar Currents, * and their tracks as the Solar and the Lunar paths, the Piṅgalā and Iḍā Nāḍīs of Haṭhayoga, respectively. The neutralisation of these Solar and Lunar forces, often described as Puruṣa and Prakṛti, by allowing them to act upon each other by certain specified means, helps to open the Natural or Middle Track which is called Suṣumṇā or Brahma Nāḍī or Śūnya Nāḍī. As soon as this Path is opened, which was till now lying blocked under a heap of dense matter, the Bindu, Vāyu and Manas rendered fine through Kriyāyoga rush into it at once and begin to take an upward course spontaneously. The awaking of Kuṇḍalinī, the opening of the Middle Path, the purification of Vāyu and Manas, the rise of Gnosis (प्रज्ञा), the dissolution of Ahaṅkāra and the knot of Ignorance (अविद्याग्रन्थि) are different names of this very act from different points of view. It is not an instantaneous act, as a rule, for the accumulated vāsanās—the heritage of the ages—have to be worked off slowly. The entire course is graduated. The Nāthas generally describe it in terms of Tantra phraseology as Ṣaṭchakrabheda, thus representing the successful transcendence of each of the six intra-organic Centres as a definite stage in the journey. This corresponds to the purgative process of the western mystics and to the bhutaśuddhi and chittaśuddhi of the upāsanā kāṇḍa of Tantra.

The secret path of Brahma (ब्रह्मनाडी) was indeed known to the Vedic seers. Leaving aside the testimony of the minor Upaniṣads, we find evidence of its knowledge in the Chhāndogya, where there is a reference to a

---

* Amaraugha Śāsana attributed to Gorakṣanātha : यत्र च मूलभगमण्डलान्ते कुण्डलिनीशक्तिर्निनिर्गता तत्र वामभागोद्भव सोमनाडिका दक्षिणभागोद्भवसूर्यनाडिका, चन्द्रो वामाङ्गव्यापकः सूर्यो दक्षिणाङ्गव्यापकः, चन्द्रो वामाङ्गे वामनासापुटं सूर्यो दक्षिणाङ्गे दक्षिणनासापुटम्–इत्येवं सूर्यचन्द्रौ व्यवस्थितौ ।

Central Nāḍī running up from the Hṛdaya to the Cranium (मूर्धा). This is evidently the Suṣumṇā. It appears from a study of the ancient literature on the subject that there were mainly four distinct views on the point from which the upward journey of the Manas was to be undertaken, the four places according to the four views being—(1) Mūlādhāra Chakra, (2) Navel, (3) Heart and (4) Middle of the two eyebrows. The Vedic Schools were generally in favour of the 'Heart', but the Nāthas preferred the first and the second places. In every case it represents the spot where the Manas and Vāyu are focussed into a Point. It is after such concentration that the Great Path reveals itself. Speaking graphically, one end of this Luminous Path represents Īśvara or Guru, and the other end enlightened Jīva or Śiṣya and the path itself the relation between the two. With continued practice the distance between the two ends begins to be reduced and the Yoga gains in strength, until at last the path disappears, leaving Īśvara and Jīva, or Śiva and Śakti, in close union with each other. As it has been stated above, the Union may be termed Identity also, in the sense that the two principles lose all semblance of distinction and inequality and become, what in reality they have always been, the Absolute.

This is **शिवशक्तिसामरस्य,** the equilibrium of Śiva and Śakti, manifesting itself in Ānanda or Divine Bliss. It presupposes Jñāna or Realisation in the manner just mentioned, and Jñāna is the natural expression of Yoga. This Jñāna alone has saving virtue. The theoretical knowledge gained from a study of books is severely condemned by the Nāthas as a useless lumber, as leading to confusion rather than illumination.

True Knowledge cannot be gained without Yoga. Merely intellectual knowledge does not avail for salvation. The

Yogabīja (verse. 64) says—"+ + योगेन रहितं ज्ञानं मोक्षाय नो भवेत्". There are indeed records in history that several people obtained knowledge directly without the need of practising Yoga. By way of illustration the names of Jaigīṣavya, Asita, Janaka, Tulādhāra, Dharmavyādha, Pailavaka, Maitreyī, Sulabhā, Śārṅgī and Śāṇḍili, to name a few among many such, may be mentioned. But it is replied that even in these cases the practice of Yoga in a previous life has to be presupposed. The Siddhas assert that a man who has obtained Knowledge but not Siddhi will be required to come under the sanctifying influence of a Siddha in course of time and through his Grace receive initiation into the mysteries of Yoga (cf Yogabīja 159—60). This is absolutely necessary for the realisation of Mokṣa.*

They lay so much emphasis on Yoga, because without its instrumentality the conquest of physical body cannot be accomplished. None but a true Yogin can rise above the limitations imposed by the body. So long as these limitations persist, which imply not only the passions but also the dependence upon the elements of nature, the stability of mind and the consequent enlightenment is not possible. The physical organism, for instance, as it exists in the present state, is considered to be the source of all evil. It is affected by the action of the five elements, is afflicted with heat and cold, and is subject to decay and death. This corruptibility of the physical body, the Yogins claim, can be over-come only by Yoga.

---

* Cf. Yogabīja (verse 31):

ज्ञाननिष्ठो विरक्तो वा धर्मज्ञो विजितेन्द्रियः ।
विना देवोऽपि योगेन न मोक्षं लभते प्रिये ॥

The Sarvasiddhānta Saṅgraha, attributed to S'aṅkarāchārya, declares the Yoga view thus: "ज्ञानमात्रेण मुक्तिः स्यादित्यालस्यस्य लक्षणम् etc.". (Patañjali Pakṣa, verses 4 et seq.).

As it is a very important issue in the study of the doctrines of the Nāthas, it is desirable to consider this question of physical purification at great length in this context. The human body, as it is ordinarily known to us with its defects and corruptions, is described by the Yogins as immature (अपक्व). It is possessed of all the characteristics of physical matter. Contact with such a body must inevitably result in the experience of Pain and in the veiling of the inherent powers of the soul. For an ordinary man therefore it becomes practically impossible to subdue the senses and the passions even with austere self-restraint. The effect of the elements of Nature makes itself felt, for all his efforts, as a disturbance of the mind. Such a man is a slave to circumstances. The so-called Jñāna is unable to remove these defects which are incidental to a dense physical body. The body as such requires therefore to be purified and rendered mature (पक्व) by means of Yoga.

The doctrine of physical immortality, which is an immediate corollary from that of physical purification referred to above, finds a special treatment in the system of the Nāthas. If the defects which cling to the dense organism can somehow be eliminated from it, the body will naturally become immune from disease, decay and death and from all the ills attendant on physical matter. It will be free from weight and capable of moving through space with the velocity of thought, assuming any shapes at will and multiplying itself to any number. It will pass through a solid wall, enter into a stone, be not drenched by water, burned by fire or affected by the wind, and it will be invisible in pure space. It will be able to expand and contract itself and will be endowed with all the Powers consequent upon the conquest of the five elements (भूतजय). A body like this is said to be rare even among the gods.

It is pure—purer than Ākāśa itself. Siddha Kāya, Divya Deha, Yoga Deha, etc. are but names of this Body, and the process of this transformation is called Dehavedha, Piṇḍasthainhya, Piṇḍa Dhāraṇa, etc.

It may be pointed out in this connection that the possession of an immortal body of this kind has been felt to be a desideratum by the mystics in all ages and in all countries. In the literature connected with Haṭha Yoga, Rasāyana (Alchemy), Tantra, etc. we find repeated references to such a body. It is said that as a base metal can be transmuted into gold (लोहवेध), in the same way a natural body may be spiritualised (देहवेध). The alchemists of the ancient age had their own method of transmutation in which mercury, mica, sulphur, etc. played an important part. They called this body by the name of "Rasamayī Tanu" and "Hara Gaurī Sṛṣṭijā Tanu," because it was effected through the action of Rasa or Mercury—the seed of Hara (Harasṛṣṭi) on one hand and Mica—the seed of Gaurī (Gaurīsṛṣṭi) on the other.*

What the alchemists professed to accomplish by means of Mercury, the Haṭha Yogins attempted through the discipline of Vāyu. It is therefore said that Karmayoga. by which the stability of the body is secured, is twofold,—

---

* The Rasahṛdaya says :-ये चात्यक्तशरीरा हरगौरीसृष्टिजां तनुं प्राप्ताः । मुक्तास्ते रससिद्धा मन्त्रगणः किङ्करो येषाम् ॥ The body referred to here is the immortal (नित्य), divine body (दिव्यतनु), produced from Rasa (Mercury) and Abhraka (Mica). The 18 varieties of Rasakarma, known as 18 Sanskāras, have to be gone through before the desired perfection in the Mercury can be obtained.

कर्मयोगेन देवेशि प्राप्यते पिण्डधारणम् । रसश्च पवनश्चेति कर्मयोगो द्विधा स्मृतः ॥ Nāgārjuna, the great Mahāyāna Teacher is said to have been a great alchemist credited with wonderful powers. He was also a Tantrist and a Yogin of rare perfection. Many of his followers too were worthy of his name. The Nāthas were apparently influenced by Nāgārjuna and his teachings. And there are indications to show that though the Nāthas were advocates of the Haṭha process, they were equally masters of the alchemic lore.

Both the Haṭha and the alchemical processes have the same limitations. They render the body immortal, pure and free. But they cannot without stepping beyond their bounds lead to the cessation of mind and the attainment of final equilibrium. They give rise to Jīvanmukti—the state in which Mind and Vāyu (Life) continue to remain steady in the Ājñā Chakra illuminated by the white radiance of the Universal Light of the Sahasrāra above. This state lasts for a long time—for countless aeons, it may be—during which time the continued Upāsanā or the course of Rāja Yoga which follows naturally tends to render the mind liable to sink gradually into the Infinite. From this it is clear that the true scope of Rāja Yoga comes in only after the Haṭha and alchemical processes terminate. * Rāja Yoga ends in the Final Illumination of Perfect Wisdom (पूर्ण प्रज्ञा), which only a thoroughly purified body and mind, such as what a Siddha Deha implies, can sustain. A natural and corruptible body is thus totally

---

* Cf. "तस्मात् दिव्यं देहं सम्पाद्य योगाभ्यासवशात् परतत्त्वे दृष्टे पुरुषार्थप्राप्तिर्भवति" (Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha, Raseśvara Section). Here the practice of Yoga is evidently in the sense of Rāja Yoga.

unfit for receiving Wisdom *—nay, incapable of practising unbroken meditation which precedes it.

To be continued.

---

[*] Cf. Rasahṛdaya :

गलितानल्पविकल्पः सर्वाध्वविवक्षितश्चिदानन्दः ।
स्फुरितोऽप्यस्फुरिततनोः करोति किं जन्तुवर्गस्य ॥

In the गोपीचन्द्रेर संन्यास by Sukur Muhammad we read—

(१) गुरु भजिले वाछा अमर हय कन्ध (कन्ध = स्कन्ध = body.)

(२) भजिले गुरुर चरण अमर हय काय ।

(३) भजन साध नाम जप हइवे अमर ।

All these passages tend to show that the principal instruction given to the disciple in the school of the Nāthas is to make the body immortal. In the Gorakṣa Vijaya of Shaikh Faizulla there are similar statements, some of which are quoted at random,—

(१) आए गुरु उलटिंया योग धर काया तोमार स्थिर कर निज मन्त्र करह स्मरण । P. 115

(२) काया साध आमि पुत्र बलि । P. 130

(३) काया साधे मीननाथ वसिया आसने । P. 198

(४) योग साधे मीननाथे स्थिर कैल काया । P. 198

III.—AN INDEX TO THE RAMAYAṆA.

(Continued from Vol. V)

By Manmatha Nāth Rāy.

Ā

ĀDITYAS, the—12 in all; included in the list of 33 Vedic Devas. Sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi (III. 14.14.-15). Requested by Indra (VII 27. 4), held themselves ready to fight with Rāvaṇa (VII. 27. 5). Made a sally from the town (VII. 27. 22). Followed Indra to fight with Rāvaṇa (VII. 28.27). Came to Rāma's court to witness the oath-taking ceremony of Sītā (VII. 97. 7).

ĀBRAVANTI—a town in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 10).

ĀBHIRAS, the—A wild tribe of the north who lived in the country of Druma-Kulya on the seas (VI.22.30). पापकर्माणः (VI.22 31).

ĀYU—Son of Pururavas and Urvaśī and father of Nahuṣa. महाबलः (VII 56. 27).

I

IKṢU (SĀGARA). ऊर्मिमान्, महारौद्रः, क्रोशन्, अनिलोद्धतः (IV. 40. 36). कालमेघप्रतिमः महोरगनिषेवितः महानादः महोदधिः (IV.40.38.) The islands lying therein were infested with huge Asuras who dwell famished there for a long time by the command of Brahman. These Asuras used to attract their victims by means of their shadows. Sugrīva asked Vinata to search for Sītā in those islands (IV. 40. 36-37).

IKSUMATI—(1) A river on which was situated the town of Sāṅkāśya. (I. 70. 3).

(2) A river crossed by Vasiṣṭha's messengers on their way to Kekaya. This was the original home of the Ikṣvākus. (II. 68. 17).

IKṢVĀKU—The progenitor of the line of kings to which Rāma belonged (I.1.8). The Rāmāyaṇa contains the history of the Kings of the line of— (I. 5. 3). Daśaratha excelled all other Kings of the line (I. 6. 2). Bhagīratha prayed to Brahman that the line of the—might not be extinguished (I. 42. 20). Prayer granted (I. 42. 22). Had a son by Alambuṣā named Viśāla (I.47.11—12). Son of Manu and founder of the royal line of Ayodhyā (I. 70. 21). Father of Kukṣi (I. 70. 22.). The land given him by Manu crossed by the exiled Rāma (II. 49. 12). The Ikṣvākus were the lords of the Earth (IV.18.6). Father of Nimi, invited to attend a sacrificial session convened by his son (VII.55.8). Appointed Vasiṣṭha his family-priest, soon after the latter's re-birth (VII. 57. 8). On the death of his father, Manu, begot a hundered sons, the youngest of whom was Daṇḍa. Finding him head-strong and dull, deputed him to rule over the country lying between the Vindhya and the Śaivāla hills. अमितप्रभ :, धर्मात्मा (VII. 79. 12-16).

INDRA—Sends forth rain (I. 9. 18.; I. 10. 29). Is offered acid gruel (अभिषुतः) by Daśaratha (I. 14. 6). Is invoked by the priests (I. 14. 8). Accorded a public reception to Kāśyapa in the heaven (I. 11. 28) An ally of Daśaratha. सहस्राक्षः (Ibid.). Rāvaṇa wanted to excel him (I. 15. 8). Was glad to learn that the queens of Daśaratha had conceived (I. 16. 32). At the desire of Brahman produced Vālin (I. 17. 17). Son of Aditi. वज्रपाणिः (I. 18. 12). Killer of the Asura Vṛtra (I. 24. 18). Purified by the Ṛṣis of the sin of killing a Brāhmaṇa (I. 24. 19-21). Granted boons to the countries, Malada and Karūṣa, for receiving the dirt and filth of his body (I. 24. 22-23). Killed Mantharā, the daughter of Virocana for wishing the destruction of all living beings (I. 25. 20). Congratulated Rāma on the destruction of Taṭakā (I. 26. 27). Vanquished by Bali (I. 29. 5). Viṣṇu asked by Kaśyapa to take birth as the younger brother of Indra (I. 29. 17). Vāmana restored the mastery of the three worlds to him (I. 29. 21) Approached Brahman along with the other Devas in quest of a commander-in-chief (I. 37. 1—2). Directed the Kṛttikas to suckle the new-born babe (I. 37. 23). Stole the sacrificial horse of Sagara in the guise of a Rākṣasa. **वासवः** (I. 39. 7-8). Viśvāmitra first heard the history of Viśālā from him. **शक्रः** (I. 45. 14). **पुरन्दरः** killed the Daityas and ruled over all the regions (I. 45. 45). Waited on Diti during the period she practised austerities, supplied her wants and massaged her limbs (I. 46. 9-11). When ten years were left, being warned by Diti about the appearance of his vanquisher (I. 46. 12-15), one noon found Diti asleep in the wrong position, so entered her womb and cut the foetus into several parts with his thunder-bolt (I. 46. 16-18). **परमात्मवान्** (I. 46. 18). When the foetus began to weep aloud at this (I. 46. 19), went on with his work saying, " Don't you weep" (I.46.20) Commanded by Diti, came out of her womb and begged her pardon (I. 46. 21-23). At the request of Diti (I. 47. 1-7), conceded that the seven parts into which the foetus had been cut, would become the seven Mārutas—lords of the seven aerial regions (I.47. 7-9). **दुराधर्षः** (I. 47. 1). **देवेशः बलसूदनः** (I 47. 2). Raped Ahalyā, the wife of Gautama ; so as a result of latter's curse, lost his testicles (I. 48. 17-28) **शचीपतिः** (I. 48. 17). **देवराजः** (I. 48 19). **सुरश्रेष्ठः** (I. 48. 20). **सुरपतिः** (I. 48. 25). **दुर्वृत्तः** (I. 48. 26). **दुर्मतिः** (I. 48. 27). Requested the Devas to get his lost glands restored to him (I. 49. 2-4). Pressed hard by the Devas (I. 49 5-7), the Pitṛs substituted a ram's glands instead (I. 49. 8). Thus became **मेषवृषणः** at the instance of Gautama (I. 49. 10). Ejected Triśaṅku from heaven and directed him to fall head foremost (I. 60. 16-18).

पाकशासनः (I. 60. 16). **महेन्द्रः** (I. 60. 18). Caused the victim of Ambarīṣa's sacrifice to disappear (I. 61. 6). The song sung by Śunah-Śepa when tied to the sacrificial post, so far pleased him (I. 62. 24-25), that he conferred the boon of long life on him (I. 62. 25-26) and Ambarīṣa too, obtained greater merits by his favour (I. 62. 26-27). Sending for Rambhā (I. 63. 26), persuaded her to tempt Viśvāmitra (I. 64. 1). To encourage her promised to accompany her with Kandarpa (I. 64. 5-7). In the guise of a Brāhmaṇa, begged of Viśvāmitra, the plate of boiled rice he was going to eat (I. 65. 5-6). **शतक्रतुः** (I. 69. 11). In accordance with a promise made to him, Paraśu rāma disarmed himself (I. 75. 17).

Helped by Daśaratha in a war against Śambara, the Asura chief (II. 9. 11). Invoked by Kaikeyī to witness the oath taken by Daśaratha (II. 11. 13-16). **वज्रिन्** (II. 23. 32). His protection invoked by Kauśalyā during Rāma's wanderings (II. 25. 9). **सहस्राक्षः सर्वदेवनमस्कृतः**. Destruction of Vṛtra at his hands referred to (II. 25. 32). The expulsion of the Daityas at the time of the churning-out of the nectar by him referred to (II. 25. 34). Carried to heaven the only son of the blind Ṛṣi pair, killed by Daśaratha (II. 64. 47). Finding Surabhi greatly perturbed and feeling the particles of tears which fell on his body from above (II. 74. 15-18), approached the Mother of Cows and enquired about the cause of her grief (II. 74. 19-20). **सुरराजः, महात्मा** (II. 74. 17). **धीमान्** (II. 74. 21). Greatly admired her filial love (II. 74. 25-26). His help sought for by Bharadvāja in the matter of entertaining Bharata's retinue (II. 91. 13). The girls attending on him requested by Bharadvāja to help him in the work (II. 91. 18).

Rāma found him talking to Śarabhaṅga, accompanied by a glorious train of followers (III. 5. 5—11). **सूर्यवैश्वानर-**

प्रभः रथप्रवरारूढः (III. 5. 5). विबुधेश्वरः संप्रभाभरणः विरजोम्बरधारी (III. 5. 6). पुरुहूतः (III. 5. 14). Finding Rāma drawing near, took leave of Śarabhaṅga and retired to heaven telling his followers that he would see Rāma when he would destroy the Rākṣasas (III. 5. 21—24). Informed Sutīkṣṇa about Rāma's exile (III. 7. 10). In order to divert the attention of a Ṛṣi from asceticism left a sword with him as a trust (III. 9. 17—18). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12. 18). पाकशासनः (III. 19. 7). Killed Namuci (III. 28. 3). Killed Vṛtra, Namuci and Bala (III. 30. 28). Gave Rāma an arrow as powerful as the Brahmadaṇḍa. मघवा (III. 30.24-25). The mystery of his visit to Śarabhaṅga's hermitage explained to Rāma by Agastya etc. (III. 30. 34-37). पुरन्दर (III. 30 III. 30. 35). His abduction of Śacī referred to (III 40. 22.). Defied by Rāvaṇa (III 48. 7). वज्रधरः (III. 48. 24). [At the direction of Brahman went to Laṅkā accompanied by Nidrā (III.56a.8). Asked her to overwhelm the Rākṣasas with sleep (III.56a.9). Approached Sītā in the Aśoka Park, and after assuring her of her speedy release from captivity on the destruction of Rāvaṇa, offered her the divine food (III.56a.10-15). Sītā having suspected his identity (III.56a.16—17), showed forth his god-like characteristics (III. 56a. 18.—19,. Left Sītā when she had taken the food (III. 56a. 26).] When Kabandha emboldened by the blessings of Brahman, went to fight with him, deformed him with the thunder bolt. When his wrath went down, elongated his arms abnormally, widened his mouth exceptionally and furnished it with sharp teeth—as a mark of favour, and promised him heaven if his arms were lopped off by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (III.71.8—16).

His duel with Namuci referred to (IV.11.22). महेन्द्रः दुर्धर्षः (IV.17.10). Pleased with Vālin for his skill in fighting gave him a divine garland of gold (IV.23.28). Committed a sin by killing the son of Tvaṣṭā. His sin shared by the Earth, water, trees and the women (IV.24,13.—14). Presented the Vānaras with the desire-yielding tree (IV.3316). Killed Puloma and Anuhlāda for abducting Śacī. **अरिहा** (IV. 39.7). Visited the Mahendra hills on sacred days. **सहस्राक्षः** (IV.41.23). Crowned King by the Devas on the Sauvarṇa hills. **हरिहयः पाकशासनः** (IV.42.35). Killed Maya with the thunderbolt for his attachment to Hemā (IV 51.14—15). Broke the left jaw of Hanūmān, when he jumped high to catch the sun (IV. 66. 23—24). Pleased with his extraordinary feat granted him the boon that he would die at will (IV.66.28—29).

Saluted by Hanūmān before he cleared the sea (V.1 8). Placed the Maināka in the sea to serve as a bar to the Asuras (V.1.90). Clipped the wings of the flying hills with the thunderbolt. When he approached the Maināka, the latter was saved by Vāyu (V. 1. 117—119). **शतक्रतुः** (V.1.117). Praised Maināka for having offered hospitality to Hanumān (V. 1. 130—134). Robbed Hiraṇyakaśipu of his fame (V.20.28). Saluted by Sitā when Hanūmān appeared as Rāma's messenger (V 32.14). Expressed agreeable surprise when Akṣa was killed by Hanūmān (V.47.37.) Being pleased with Janaka gave him a water-born jewel. **धीमान्** (V.66.5).

Vanquished and brought to Laṅkā as a prisoner by Indrajit, and then released at the instance of Brahman. **शम्बर-वृत्रहा** (VI.7.22—23). Fought with Saṁnādana—the ancestor of the Vānaras (VI. 27. 19). Defeated by Kumbhakarṇa (VI.61.9). Hurled his thunderbolt at Kumbhakarṇa when he began to devour the creatures (VI. 61. 13—15). Struck by Kumhha karṇa with the Airāvata's tusk in return (VI. 61. 17). Approached Brahman for remedial measures (VI.61.18). Killed a sage (Viśvarūpa by name) and then performed expiatory rites (VI.83.29). Defended Lakṣmaṇa when he fought with Indra-jit (Vi.90.63). Went into raptures when Indra-jit was killed (VI.90.84). To remove the cause of complaint (V.102.5), ordered Mātali to take the divine car to Rāma on earth (VI.102.6—7). Appeared before Rāma and admonished him for iil-treating Sitā (VI.117.2—9). Offered to grant favors to Rāma (VI. 120.1—2). Granted Rāma's prayers in favor of the Vānaras (VI.120.11—16).

Accompanied Brahman to grant boons to Kuvera (VII. 3.13). Attended the sacrificial session of the King Marutta, but assumed the form of a peacock for fear of Rāvaṇa (VII. 18.4—5). On the departure of Rāvaṇa came out of his place of refuge and offered boons to the peacocks (VII.18. 20—23). Rāvaṇa having invaded his regions (VII.27.1—2), became agitated and asking the assemled Devas to hold themselves in readiness for action, went to Viṣṇu and asked him to fight and grant victory (VII.27.3—13). When the Devas took to flight at the very sight of Meghanāda re-assembled them and put his son, Jayanta, at their head (VII.28. 4—6). On the defeat of his son drove to the front with Mātali, at the head of various divinities (VII.28.23—28). Reading Rāvaṇa's thought (VII.29.4—9), signified his desire of making Rāvaṇa a prisoner (VII. 29. 10—14). After manoeuvring for sometime succeeded in capturing the person of Rāvaṇa (VII.29.15—19). Made a captive by Indra-jit (VII.2927). On being released, fell into a deep reverie (VII. 30. 16-17). In accordance with Brahman's advice (VII. 30. 47-48) went to heaven after performing the Vaiṣṇava sacrifice (VII. 30. 49-50). On hearing the report of Rāhu (VII. 35. 31-35) went to Sūrya's abode riding on the Airāvata with him (VII. 35. 36-38). Promised help to Rāhu (VII. 35. 43). Finding Hanūmān coming towards the Airāvata, struck him with the thunderbolt (VII. 35.

46). On the recommendation of Brahman (VII. 36, 7-9), gave Hanumān a garland of lotus, and made him proof against his thunderbolt (VII. 36, 10-12).

Begot Vālin on the Ṛkṣa-rāṭ who had been transformed into a woman (VII. 37 a). 31-37). Performed a sacrifice, simultaneously with Nimi, and asked Vasiṣṭha to conduct it (VII. 55. 10-11). Māndhātā's resolve to conquer the heavens (VII. 67. 5-6), having made him uneasy, persuaded him to make a thorough conquest of the world he lived in at first (VII. 67. 7-11). In reply to the Rājā's query (VII. 67. 12) named Lavaṇa (VII. 67. 13). On the death of Lavaṇa (VII. 69. 36), appeared before Śatrughna to grant boons (VII. 70. 1-3). Disappeared after granting him boons (VII. 70. 6-7). Congratulated Rāma on the death of Śambūka (VII. 76. 5-6). Vṛtra having taken to practise austerities (VII. 84. 9-10) complained bitterly against him to Viṣṇu and pleaded for his destruction (VII. 84. 11-18). Led the Devas to the spot where Vṛtra was practising austerities (VII. 85. 10). Struck Vṛtra on the head with the thunderbolt (VII. 85. 13). The pursuit of the Brahma-hatyā made his life miserable (VII. 85. 15-16). On the disappearance of Indra in the nether world, the earth shrivelled up and the rivers dried up (VII. 86. 2-5). Celebrated the Horse-Sacrifice as directed by Viṣṇu (VII. 8. 6. 9). Installed in former position, once more revivified the earth (VII. 86. 19). Showered flowers on Lakṣmaṇa (VII. 106. 16). Carried Lakṣmaṇa bodily to heaven (VII. 106. 17). Paid his respects to Viṣṇu (VII. 110. 13).

INDRA-JANU. A Vānara chief who in response to Sugrīva's call joined him with 11 krores of Vānaras. वारः (IV. 39. 31-32.) Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 22).

INDRA-ŚATRU—A Rākṣasa chief who in the court of Rāvaṇa stood ready with his arms to kill Rāma etc बलवान् (VI. 9. 2).

INDRA-ŚIRĀ—A country famous for its Airāvata elephants (II 70. 23).

ILA—Son of the Prajāpati Kardama, Rājā of Bālhī, श्रीमान्, सुधार्मिकः, महायशाः, ruled impartially over the three worlds, duly honored by the Devas, Daityas, Nāgas etc. who were afraid of incurring his displeasure—धर्मे वीर्ये च निष्ठितः, बुद्ध्या च परमोदारः (VII. 87. 3-7). In the course of a hunting excursion visited the spot where Mahāsena was born (VII. 87. 8-10). At once became a girl along with his attendants; then knowing that it was the work of the Great Śiva, took refuge with him (VII. 87. 14-18.). Śiva having refused to restore him to his former state (VII. 87. 19-20) sought refuge with Umā (VII. 87. 20-23). The goddess having consented to grant a half of his desire (VII. 87. 24-25) prayed that he might become male and female in alternate months (VII. 87. 29). Thus he became a man one month and a beautiful woman the next month (VII. 87. 29). In the first month she wandered in the hilly regions till she came across Budha who was practising austerities in a lake (VII. 88. 4—11). Willingly yielded to the advances made by Budha (VII. 89. 5—6). Spending a month in the company of Budha as a woman (VII. 89. 7—8), one morning assumed his former state, and anxiously enquired from Budha about his retinue (VII.89. 9—11). पूर्णेन्दुसदृशाननः (VII.89.9). In reply to Budha's request to stay there for sometime (VII.89.12—14) refused to comply (VII. 89. 15—18). Pressed by Budha (VII. 89.19—20) agreed to stay there for a year, at the end of which he gave birth to Purū-ravā whom he gave away to Budha (VII. 89. 21—25). His manhood having been restored by Śiva (VII. 90. 18—20), moved to the Madhya Deśa after founding Pratiṣṭhāna (VII.90.21—22).

ILVALA—An asura of the Daṇḍaka forests who with the help of his brother Vātāpi used to kill thousands of innocent Brāhmaṇas. Burnt to death by Agastya (III. 11. 55—66).

UCCAIH-ŚRAVĀ—The best horse which came up in the course of the churning of the ocean (I. 45. 39). [The Sun-God's riding animal (VII. 23 (b).5).]

UJJIHĀNĀ—a town abounding with the Priyaka trees. Here Bharata on his way back from Ayodhyā changed horses. (II.71.12—13).

UTKALA—A country in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV.41.9).

UDAYÂCALA, THE—Hills to the east. Sugrīva asked Hanumān to send for the Vānaras dwelling there (IV. 37.4). **हेममयः श्रीमान्** (IV. 40.54). The table-land at its top, a hundred yojanas in extent, clad in Sāla, tamāla, tāla & karṇikāra etc., is gilded by the rays of the Sun (IV. 40.54-56). Visited by Sugrīva during his flight from Vālin's wrath (IV. 46.15).

UDĀ-VASU—Son of Janaka and father of Nandi-Vardhana (I.71.5).

UNMATTA—A Rākṣasa chief, son of Mālyavān & Sundarī (VII. 5. 34. 36).

UPENDRA—**दुःसहः** (IV.17.10).

UMĀ—The second daughter of Himavān and Menā (1.35.15). **रूपेणाप्रतिमा भुवि** (1.35.13). Practised severe austerities. **तपोधना** (1.35.19). **उग्रेण तपसा युक्ता, लोकनमस्कृता.** Married to Rudra (1.35.20). Had marital relation with Mahādeva for a hundred divine years, yet there was no consummation of the act (1.36.6). On a representation being made by gods (1.36.8-11), Śiva promised to hold the energy himself in co-operation with Umā (1. 36. 12-13). The name of the Earth having been suggested by the Devas as the fitting receptacle for holding the dislodged energy of the Great One, he discharged the semen there (1.36.14-16). Honored by the

Devas. (1.36.19-20). Cursed the Earth, and the Devas for having frustrated her desire to have a son (1.36.20-24). Rāvaṇa remembered her curses (VI.60.11). Taking pity on the weeping child, Sukeśa (VII.4.26), ordained that the Rākṣasīs were to be delivered of their children as soon as they had conceived, and that the babes were to attain the age of their mothers as soon as they were born (VII.4.30-31). When Rāvaṇa attempted to uproot the Kailāsa hills, being nervous she hugged her Lord closely (VII.16.26). Sported with her Lord at the spot where Kārtikeya was born (VII.87.11). Rājā Ila having sought her help (VII.87.20-23), said that she could fulfil only a half of his desire (VII.87.24-25). **शैलराजसुता** (VII.87.21). **सुरुचिरानना.** Agreed to his proposal (VII.87.26-27), on condition that he would not remember the incidents of one state of being in the other (VII.87.27-29).

URMILĀ—Second daughter of Janaka II (I. 71. 22). Her hand promised to Lakṣmaṇa by Janaka II (1.71.21-2). **यशस्विनी** Warmly received by the mothers-in-law (1.77,10-12). Visited the temples and bowed down before the elders (1.77.13). Enjoyed with her husband (1 77.14).

URVAŚĪ—Scornfully rejected the suit of Rājā Pururavā (III.48.18). **परमाप्सरा,रूपसम्पन्ना,पद्मपलाशाक्षी,पूर्णचन्द्रनिभानना** (VII.56.13-15). Entered the sea along with her companions for sports (VII.56.13). In reply to Varuṇa's advances (VII. 56.14-15), said that she had already been engaged by Mitra (VII. 56 16). Expressed her fondness for him, and felt sorry for her body was already Mitra's (VII. 56. 19-20). Then, true to her appointment, approached Mitra (VII. 56. 22). Cursed by him (VII. 56.22-25), became the wife of Pururavā (VII. 56.26). Returned to heaven on the expiry of the period of banishment. **चारुदती, सुनेत्रा,सुभ्रूः** (VII.56.29).

ULKĀ-MUKHA—A Vānara chief,son of Agni (हुताशन). Sugrīva wanted to send him to the South in search of Sītā (IV.41.4).

UŚĪRA-BĪJA, THE—Hills—where lived Pramāthi-the Vānara chief (VI.27.27). King Marutta held his sacrificial sessions there (VII.18.2).

ṚKṢA CAVE, THE—Seen by the Vānara chiefs, Hanūmān, Aṅgada etc. while searching for Sītā in the Vindhya regions (IV.50.7). दानवेनाभिरक्षितः(IV.50.8). सुगन्धि दुरतिक्रमः (IV.50.10). नानासत्त्वसमाकीर्णः दैत्येन्द्रनिलयोपमः (VI.50.12). दुर्दर्शः घोरः दुर्विगाह्यः (VI. 50. 13). अचन्द्रसूर्यः तिमिरावृतः (IV. 50. 71-18). नानापादपसंकुलः (IV. 50. 21). The well-furnished gardens, lakes and palaces of Maya which stood there described (IV. 50. 25-37).

ṚKṢA-rāja. (also Ṛkṣarāṭ)— Father of Vālin & Sugrīva, king of all the Vānaras, glorious like the sun. Died after a long reign (VII.36.36-37). [Born from the drop of tear that had rolled down the cheek of Brahman, spent sometime in the Meru hills, subsisting on fruits and roots; translated into a beautiful woman as soon as he leapt into a lake to fight with his own shadow (VII.37(*a*)8-30). Gave birth to Vālin and Sugrīva from Indra and Sûrya respectively, then again became a man. Approached Brahman with the babes (VII.37.(*a*)31-45). Greeted by him, he was appointed to rule over the Vānaras dwelling in Kiṣkindhā (VII.37(*a*).45-57).

ṚKṢAVĀN, THE—Hills, at the foot of which dwelt thousands of Vānaras (I. 71. 31). Where dwelt Dhūmra, the Ṛkṣa chief; situated near the Narmadā (VI.27.9).

ṚCIKA—(i) Married Satyavatī, the elder sister of Viśvāmitra (1 34.7). Resided at Bhṛgu tuṅga with his wife & 3 children (1.61.11). In reply to Ambarīṣa's request (1. 61.12-15) refused to sell the eldest son (1.61.16).

ṚCIKA (ii)—भार्गवः महातेजाः (1. 75.22). Obtained the great Vaiṣṇva bow from Viṣṇu. His son was Jamadagni (I.75.22-23).

ṚṢABHA (i)—A mountain situated in the midst of the Kṣīroda Ocean महान् श्वेतः । Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sītā (IV. 40. 44). दिव्यगन्धैः कुसुमितैः आचितैः नगैः वृतः (IV. 40. 45).

ṚṢABHA (ii)—A range of hills in the Southern seas. सर्वरत्नमयः श्रीमान् । There grew up various kinds of brilliant sandals which were under the protection of the Rohitas—a class of Gandharvas ; the home of the 5 Gandharva Lords (IV. 41. 40-43). निवासः पुण्यकर्मणाम् (IV. 41. 43).

ṚṢABHA (iii)—A king who re-peopled Ayodhyā (VII. 111. 10).

ṚṢABHA (iv)—A Vānara chief who in response to Aṅgada's appeal said that he could jump over 40 yojanas (IV. 65. 5). वानरर्षभः. Placed in charge of the right wing of the expeditionary force by Rāma (VI. 4. 16). Accompanied the van-guard (VI. 4. 30). Placed in charge of the right flank of the invading army (VI. 24. 15). Fought at the south gate under Aṅgada (VI. 41. 39-40). At Rāma's desire (VI. 45. 1-3) went up to discover the position taken up by Indrajit, but foiled (VI. 45. 4-5). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI. 47. 3-4). Attacked Rāvaṇa with a huge stone but disabled (VI. 59. 42-43). Attacked Kumbhakarṇa who squeezed him mortally (VI. 67. 24-27). Son of Varuṇa (VI. 70. 60). Fought a duel with Matta in the course of which killed him (VI. 70. 49-65). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 45). On the occasion of Rāma's coronation fetched water from the Southern seas (VI. 128. 54).

ṚṢABHA-SKANDHA—A Vānara chief who at the desire of Rāma (VI. 45. 1-3), went up to discover the position taken up by Indrajit, but foiled (VI. 45. 4-5).

ṚṢI-PUTRAS, THE—Vānara chiefs whom Sugrīva proposed to send to the west in search of Sītā (IV. 42. 5).

ṚṢṬIKA—A country in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 10).

ṚṢYAMŪKA, Hills, THE—Rāma's visit to—foreseen by Vālmîki (I. 3. 23). Sugrīva along with four other Vānaras led the life of an exile there (III. 72. 12). Kabandha advised Rāma to hasten thither (III. 72. 21). Stood overlooking the Pampā lake (III. 73. 31). पुष्पितद्रुमः (Ibid.) दुःखारोहणः शिशुनागाभिरक्षितः उदारः Created in olden times by Brahman (III. 73. 32). The dreams dreamt by a man sleeping at its top become true when he wakes up, and a sinful man is beaten by the Rākṣasas while asleep there (III. 73. 33—34). Abounding with elephants and the Ruru deer (III. 73. 35—39). Situated on the bank of the Pampā. विविधधातुमण्डितः चित्रपुष्पितपादपः (III. 75. 25—26). Situated on the south of the Pampā (IV. I. 73). धातुभिः विभूषितः (IV. I. 74). गिरिवरः (IV. 10. 28). Vālin could not go there for fear of Mataṅga's curse (IV. II. 64). शैलमुख्यः (IV. 24. 7). Sugrīva sought refuge there to escape from Vālin's wrath (IV. 46. 23). Rāma's car passed across—(VI. 123. 38—40).

ṚṢYAŚṚṄGA—Son of Vibhāṇḍaka and grand-son of Kāśyapa (I. 9. 3). Brought up by his father in the forest. मुनिः, वनचरः (I. 9. 4). विप्रेन्द्रः द्वैविध्यं (मुख्यम् and गौणम्) ब्रह्मचर्यम् [पालयति] (I. 9. 5). Tended the fire and his father. Praised alike by the people and the Brāhmaṇas (I. 9. 6—7). ब्राह्मणः वेदपारगः (I. 9. 13). Brought to the Aṅgas by the prostitutes, the severe drought disappeared and he was married to Śāntā—the daughter of Romapāda. "He would advise Daśaratha as to the means of getting sons" (I. 9. 18—19). वनचरः, तपःस्वाध्यायसंयुतः, नारीणां विषयाणां सुखस्य च अनभिज्ञः

(I. 10. 3). Seduced by the courtesans, came to the Aṅgas, then marrying Śāntā established himself there (I. 10. 7—33). Sanat Kumāra's prophecy repeated by Sumantra (I. 11. 1—12). द्विजश्रेष्ठः (I. 11. 15). दीप्यमान इवानलः (I. 11. 16). Introduced to Daśaratha by the king Romapāda, paid a visit to Ayodhyā, and lived there with his wife as a guest of the king (I. 11. 17—31). Being requested by Daśaratha to conduct the Aśvamedha Sacrifice (I. 12. 2), accepted the office and issued instructions (I. 12. 3—4). Asked Daśaratha to proceed to the Sacrificial grounds (I. 13. 39). Was given the seat of honor by Vasiṣṭha etc. (I. 13. 40), (I. 14. 2). Invoked Indra and other Devas by repeating the Sāma Vedic hymns (I. 14. 8). Distributed the sacrificial fees among the priests (I. 14. 52). Promised four sons to Daśaratha (I. 14. 59). मेधावी, वेदज्ञः offered to celebrate the Putreṣṭi Sacrifice on behalf of the king (I. 15. 1—2). Conducted it (I. 15. 3). Bade farewell to Daśaratha (I. 18. 6).

EKA-JAṬĀ—A Rākṣasī guard of Sītā who reproved her for having refused Rāvaṇa's advances (V. 23. 5—9).

EKA-SĀLA—A village where Bharata crossed the river Sthāṇumatī on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 16).

ELEPHANTS, THE REGIONAL (दिशागजाः)—Virūpākṣa in the east, Mahāpadma in the south, Sanmanas in the west, and Bhadra in the north. The sons of Sagara came across and paid respects to them while they penetrated into the Rasātala in search of the sacrificial horse spirited away by Indra (I. 40. 12—23). Support the Earth on their heads (I. 40. 14 ; 18 ; 22). Earthquake occurs whenever out of fatigue, they move their heads (I. 40. 15). Honored by the Devas, Dānavas etc. Aṁśumān met them and enquired about his missing uncles and the cattle-lifter (I. 41. 7—8). वाक्यज्ञाः, वाक्यकोविदाः Predicted the success of his mission one by one (I. 41. 9—11). Children of Śvetā (III. I4. 26).

AIRĀVATA—The son of Irāvatī. लोकनाथः महागजः (III. 14. 24). Haunted the aerial regions देवराजगजः (V. 1. 168). Rāvaṇa's arms bore the marks of his trunk (V. 10. 16). Compared to an island in the Sky-sea (V. 57. 3). कैलासकूटाभः, चतुर्दन्तः, मदस्रवः, श्रृंगारधारी, प्रांशुः, स्वर्णघण्टाट्टहासी, करीन्द्रः (VII. 35. 37. 38). Indra went to Sūrya's abode riding on him (VII. 35. 37—38).

AILADHĀNA—Bharata on his way back from Kekaya crossed a river there (II. 71. 3).

OṀ-KĀRA—महातेजाः came to the hermitage of Budha while he was consulting his friends with regard to Ila (VII. 90. 9). Accompanied Rāma on the occasion of his Great Renunciation (VII. 109. 8).

OṢADHI HILL, THE—a part of the Kailāsa peak situate in the Himālayan regions. Jāmbavān asked Hanumān to fetch some medicinal herbs that would bring round the wounded and disabled Vānaras (VI. 74. 29—34). When Rāvaṇa mortally wounded Lakṣmaṇa with the Śakti weapon, Suṣeṇa directed Hanūmān to go there once more for fetching the medicinal herbs (VI. 101. 29—32).

KAKUTSTHA—Son of Bhagîratha and father of Raghu (I. 70. 39).

KAṆḌU (i)—The sage who killed cows at the command of his father ऋषिः वनचारिण विपश्चित् (II. 21. 31).

KAṆḌU (ii)—महाभागः सत्यवादी तपोधनः महर्षिः परमामर्षी। नियमैः दुष्प्रधर्षणः (IV. 48 11-12). महामुनिः धर्मात्मा (V. 48. 13). Reduced the thriving forest south of the Vindhyas to a water-less and tree-less desert on the death of his ten-year old son (IV. 48. 11-14).

KAṆVA—A great Ṛṣi of the east who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 2).

KADRU—A daughter of Kaśyapa and Krodha-Basā (III. 14. 22). Mother of the snakes (III. 14. 28). Sister of Surasā (III. 14. 31x). Gave birth to a thousand snakes who support the earth (III. 14. 32).

KANAKHALA—Where the poor Brāhmaṇa regained his lost cow (VII. 53. 11).

KANDARPA (Kāma)—tried to disturb the mind of Mahādeva while he was sauntering with the Maruts (I. 23. 11). Reduced to ashes by the Great God in consequence (I. 23. 13). अनंग (I. 23. 14). Accompanied Indra to disturb Viśvāmitra (I. 64. 6). Withdrew after his discomfiture (I. 64. 15). His reduction to ashes referred to. मन्मथः (III. 56. 10).

KAPAṬA—A Rākṣasa chief whose palace was visited by Hanumān (V. 6. 24).

KAPILA—An incarnation of Viṣṇu, who supports the Earth continuously. The destruction of the sons of Sagara at his hands, foretold by Brahman (I. 40. 3). Being assaulted by the sons of Sagara, reduced them to ashes (I. 40. 24-30). The destruction of the sons of Sagara by him referred to by Garuḍa. (I. 41. 18). Being assailed by Rāvaṇa in the Western Sea, easily vanquished him, and then slipped into the Pātāla regions (VII. 23 (e). 3-32).

KAPĪ-VATĪ, The—a river crossed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya. (II. 71. 15).

KABANDHA—An odd-looking Rākṣasa killed by Rāma near the hermitage of Mataṅga Ṛṣi. His corpse cremated by Rāma. Assuming a divine form directed Rāma to see Śabarī (I. 1. 55-56). The whole episode foreseen by Vālmiki (I. 3. 21). सुमहाकायः राक्षसः विपुलोरसः (III.

69. 26). विवृद्धः अशिरोग्रीवः उदरे मुखः (III. 69. 27). तीक्ष्णैः निशितैः रोमभिः उच्छ्रितः महागिरिरिव नीलमेघनिभः रौद्रः मेघस्तनितनिस्वनः (III. 69. 28). उरसि अग्निज्वालानिकाशेन ललाटस्थेन दीप्यता महापक्ष्मेण पिङ्गेन विपुलेनायतेन च एकेन घोरेण सुदर्शिना नयनेन (युक्तः)महादंष्ट्रोपपन्नः सः लेलिहानः महामुखः (III. 69. 29-30). With his unusually long arms—(a yojana in length each) used to draw various creatures for devouring them (III. 69. 31-32). Stood barring the way of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with his long arms (III. 69. 33). महान् दारुणः भीमः भुजसंवृतः अतिघोरप्रदर्शनः (III. 69. 34). Captured the two brothers (III. 69. 35); enquired the reason of their visit to those lonely forests and threatened to devour them (III. 69. 42-46). महाबाहुः दानवोत्तमः (III. 69. 43). दुरात्मा (III. 69. 46). Threatened to devour the princes (III. 70. 1-2). Hearing the words of reproof uttered by Lakṣmaṇa (III. 76. 3-6) got angry and opened his mouth wide to devour them (III. 70. 7). His arms lopped off by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, whereupon he fell down roaring aloud (III. 70. 8-10). Besmeared in blood in a piteous tone asked who they were (III. 70. 11). दानवः (III. 70. 11). When Lakṣmaṇa had introduced Rāma and himself (III. 70. 13-16), remembering Indra's words, welcomed them and proceeded to relate how he came to possess that fearful appearance (III. 70. 17-19). In the course of his narrative told how he earned the curse of the Ṛṣi Sthūlaśirā for frightening the Ṛṣis assuming that very form; how being emboldened by the blessings of Brahman he went to fight with Indra and in consequence was deformed by him with his Vajra; how both assured him that he would recover his original form if he died in the hands of Rāma and was cremated by him (III. 71. 1-20). Requested by Rāma to suggest the means of recovering Sītā from the clutches of Rāvaṇa (III. 71. 20-26), said that until he was cremated in due form he could not

help him in any way (III. 71. 26-34). कुशलः वक्ता (III. 71. 27). Cremated by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, appeared in the midst of the flames assuming a divine form, seated on the aerial car drawn by swans (III. 72. 1-6). Advised Rāma to establish friendly relations with Sugrīva who had been exiled by his brother Vālin and was just then living on the Ṛṣya-mûka hills along with four Vānaras. He alone, thought he, could help Rāma in recovering Sitā from the clutches of the cannibals (III. 72. 1-27). Then described in detail the route to the cave where Sugrīva dwelt at the top of the Ṛṣya-mûka hills overlooking the Pampā Lake (III. 73. 2-42). अर्थज्ञः (III. 73. 1). So saying bade the princes farewell advising them once more to form an alliance with Sugrīva (III. 73. 42-46). स्रग्वी भास्करवर्णाभः वीर्यवान् (III. 73. 43). भास्वरसर्वदेहः (III. 73. 46). His parting advice to Rāma to approach Sugrîva referred to by Lakṣmaṇa (IV. 4. 15-16).

KAMPANA—A Rākṣasa chief whom Rāvaṇa asked to accompany Kumbha and Nikumbha to the battle-field (VI.75.47). Killed by Aṅgada (VI.76.1-3).

KARAVĪRĀKṢA—a general of Khara who went to fight with Rāma (III. 23. 32). महावीर्यः बलाध्यक्षः Attacked Rāma with his army at the command of Khara (III. 26. 27—28).

KARĀLA—A Rākṣasa chief whose palace was visited by Hanumān (V. 6. 26). Hanumān set fire to his house (V. 54. 14).

KARŪṢA—So called because it received the hunger (कारूषम्) of Indra after he had killed Vṛttra who was a Brāhmaṇa. Formerly a flourishing country, but devastated by Tāṭakā and her son Mārīca. Nobody dared to pass through (I. 24. 18—32).

KARDAMA—The first of the Prajā-Patis (III. 14. 7). Father of Rājā Ila (VII. 87. 3). Arrived at the hermitage of Budha when he was consulting his friends with regard to Ila (VII. 90. 8). महातेजा: Proposed that they should propitiate Śiva on behalf of Ila, by celebrating the Horse-sacrifice (VII. 90. 11-12).

KALĀ—The eldest daughter of Bibhīṣaṇā who at the desire of her mother informed Sītā that Rāvaṇa had rejected her father's proposal of returning her to Rāma (V. 37. 9-11).

KALIṄGA— (i) A town situated on the border of an extensive Sāla-forest visited by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 16).

(ii) Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go to that country in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 11).

KALMĀṢAPĀDA—तेजस्वी son of Raghu; became a Rākṣasa as the result of a curse; father of Śaṅkhaṇa (I. 70. 39-40).

KAVACAS, THE—A class of Daityaswho dwelt in the Jewelled Town. Fought without intermission for a year with Rāvaṇa when he attacked them and at last formed an alliance with him on the mediation of Brahman (VII. 23. 6-14).

KAVAṢA—A great sage of the West who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. I. 4).

KAŚYAPA (ALSO KĀŚYAPA)—a sacrificial priest (पौर्वक) of Daśaratha (I. 7. 5). Being sent for by Daśaratha, came to Ayodhyā to conduct the Horse-sacrifice (I. 8. 6). On the way to Mithilā the conveyance carrying him preceded that of Daśaratha (I. 69. 5-6). On the morning following the death of Daśaratha, attended the court and advised Vasiṣṭha to appoint a king without delay (II. 67. 5-8). Helped Vasiṣṭha in conducting the consecration ceremony of

Rāma (VI. 128. 60). Summoned by Rāma, entered his presence-chamber and was duly received (VII. 74. 4-5). Consulted by Rāma on the eve of the Horse-sacrifice (VII. 91. 2). Witnessed the oath-taking ceremony of Sītā at Rāma's court (VII. 96. 2).

KAŚYAPA—accorded a public reception by Indra in heaven (I. 11. 28). Pleased Viṣṇu by practising austerities for a thousand years. अग्निसमप्रभः, ओजसा दीप्यमान इव (I. 29. 10-11). Prayed that he might beget Viṣṇu as a son on Aditi to relieve the Devas in distress (I. 29. 15-17). Son of Marīci (I. 29. 15). Granted a boon to Diti that if she could keep clean for a thousand years, she would give birth to a child who would kill Indra. महातेजाः (I. 46. 4-7). Son of Marīci and father of Vivasvān (I. 70. 20). Received the gift of the universe from Paraśu-Rāma (I. 75 8; 25). Made him promise that he would not reside in his dominions (I. 76. 13). The last of the Prajāpatis (III. 14. 9). Married 8 daughters of Dakṣa (III. 14. 11-12). Granted a boon to his wives that they would give birth to children as famous as himself (III. 14. 12-13). Came from the north to greet Rāma on his return home (VII 1. 5). Progenitor of the Devas and the Daityas (VII. 11. 15)

KAHOLA—A धर्मात्मा Brāhmaṇa finally emancipated by Aṣṭāvakra (VI. 119. 16.).

KĀKUTSTHA—of the royal house of VIŚĀLĀ, son of Somadatta (I. 47. 16). His son was Sumati (I. 47. 17).

KĀÑCANA Hills, The—where lived Kesarī the Vānara Chief (VI. 27. 37). Described (VI. 27. 34-37).

KAÑCANA.—Priest to Śatrughna. Being sent for, attended his royal patron's court (VII. 108. 8).

KĀTYĀYANA—a sacrificial priest (पौर्वकः) to Daśaratha (I. 7. 5). Being sent for, came to Ayodhyā to officiate in the Horse-sacrifice (I. 8. 6). On the way to Mithilā the chariot carrying him preceded that of Daśaratha (I. 69. 3-6). On the morning following the demise of Daśaratha, attended the court and advised Vasiṣṭha to appoint a king without delay (II. 67. 3-8). Helped Vasiṣṭha in conducting the consecration ceremony of Rāma (VI. 128. 60). Summoned by Rāma, entered his presence-chamber and was duly received (VII. 74. 4-5).

KĀMA, The—A range of hills near the Kailāsa. अवृत्तः Inaccessible to the Devas, Rākṣasas and the living beings. Sugrîva asked Śata-Bala to ransack its caves and sides in search of Sîtā (IV. 43. 28-29).

KĀMPILYA—a town ruled over by Rājā Brahmadatta (I. 33. 19).

KĀMBOJA—famous for horses (I. 6. 22). Sugrīva asked Śatabala to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 43. 12).

KĀMBOJAS, THE—Mentioned along with the Yavana soldiers created by Vasiṣṭha's cow to offer resistance to Viśvāmitra's cupidity (I. 54. 21). Pressed hard by Viśvāmitra (I. 54. 23). Born of the Yell of Śabali. रविसन्निभाः (I. 55. 2).

KĀRUPATHA—A country रमणीयः निरामयः (VII. 102. 5).

KĀRTAVĪRYA—In Rāma's opinion Lakṣmaṇa excelled Kārtavīrya as the former could discharge 500 arrows at a time (VI. 49. 20).

KĀRTIKEYA—born in a thicket of glowing reeds on the white hill—the petrified energy of Śiva. अग्नि-सम्भवः (I. 36. 18-19) Born of the fetus deposited by Gaṅgā by the side of the Himavān (I 37. 18). The Devas appointed the kṛttikās to feed the baby (I. 37. 23). Hence called Kārtikeya by the Devas; his future greatness foretold (I. 37. 25). Bathed by the Kṛttikās. दीप्यमानः यथानलः (I. 37. 26). Also called Skanda, because born of the discharged energy of Śiva and Umā महाबाहुः ज्वलनोपमः (I. 37. 27). Sucked the breast of all the six Kṛttikās with as many mouths (I. 37. 28). After a single day, vanquished the army of the Daityas through his prowess (I. 37. 29). Elected Commander-in-Chief by the Devas (I. 27. 30). His votaries attain ripe old age begetting sons and grand-children; and on death go to the Skanda-Loka (I. 37, 32). His protection invoked by Kausalyā during Rāma's sojourn (II. 25. 11). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12. 21). The weeping baby in the bush of reeds referred to (VII. 35. 22). महासेनः His birth-place visited by Rājā Ila (VII. 87. 10).

KÂLA THE—A range of hills in the Somâśrama in the north having a rich table-land on the top. Sugrīva asked Satabala to ransack the hills and the caves in search of Sîtâ (IV. 43. 14—15). शैलेन्द्रः हेमगर्भः महागिरिः (IV. 43. 16).

KÂLA—In the guise of an ascetic came to the palace and told Lakṣmaṇa that he wanted to have a private interview with Râma (VII. 103. 1—2). तपसा भास्करप्रभः (VII. 103.4). तेजोभिः ज्वलन्निव, अंशुभिः प्रदहन्निव (VII. 103.6). Having been shewed in by Lakṣmaṇa (VII. 103. 6) greeted Râma (VII. 103. 7). वदतां वरः Took his seat (VII. 103. 9). In reply to Râma's request (VII. 103. 10) said that as his business was private, every one was to be warned against intercepting them on pain of death (VII. 103. 11—12). Introduced himself as his son—a Prajâpati born of his navel after the creation of the Earth; then in the words of Brahman warned him that his lease of life on earth was drawing to a close and that it was high time for him to retire to heaven (VII. 104. 1—15). सर्वसंहारः (VII. 104, 16).

KÂLAKA—Son of Kaśyapa and Kâlakâ (III. 14. 17).

KÂLAKÂ—Daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III. 14. 10—11). Gave birth to two sons—Naraka and Kâlaka by favor of her husband (III. 14. 17).

KÂLAKÂRMUKA—a general of khara who went to fight with Râma परुषः (III. 23. 32). महावीर्यः बलाध्यक्षः. Attacked Râma with his army at the command of Khara (III. 26. 27—28).

KÂLAKEYAS THE—A class of Daityas who dwelt in the Aśma Town. Defeated and massacred by Râvaṇa (VII. 23. 17—19).

KÂLANEMI—Defeated and killed by Viṣṇu (VII. 6.34).

KÂLA—MAHĪ, THE—River. Sugrîva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sîtâ. शैलकाननशोभिता (IV. 40. 22).

KÂLIKÂMUKHA—A Râkṣasa chief, son of Sumâlin and Ketumatī (VII. 5. 38—39).

KĀLINDĪ—One of the wives of Asita. Retired to the Himâlayas with her defeated husband. She and her co-wife were pregnant at the time of Asita's death. Administered poison by her co-wife to bring about an abortion, but by favor of the sage Cyavana gave birth to Sagara (I. 70. 29-36). कमलेक्षणा (I. 70. 35). राजपुत्री पतिव्रता देवी (I. 70. 36).

KÂLINDĪ, The—river. Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in search Sitā (IV. 40 21).

KÂLIYA—a courtier of Râma who with light talks sought to divert his master (VII. 43. 2).

KĀVERĪ, The—A river in the South. दिव्या आपगा प्रसन्नसलिलाशया, अप्सरोगणैः विहृता । Sugrîva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītâ (IV. 41. 14-15).

KÂŚĪ—Râjâ of—invited to attend the Horse sacrifice celebrated by Daśaratha (I. 13. 23). Daśaratha offers the produce of—to appease the wrath of Kaikeyī (II, 10. 37-38).

Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in search of Sîtâ(IV. 40. 22). पुरी वाराणसी रमणीया सुप्राकारा सुतोरणा (VII. 38. 15-19).

KÂŚYAPA (ALSO KAŚYAPA)—a sacrificial priest to Daśaratha (I. 7. 5). Came to Ayodhyâ at the desire of the king to officiate in the Horse Sacrifice (I.8. 6). On the way to Mithilâ his carriage preceded the one of Daśaratha (I. 69. 5-5). On the morning following the demise of the king, attended the court and advised Vasiṣṭha to appoint a king without delay (II. 67. 5-8). Helped Vasiṣṭha in conducting the consecration ceremony of Râma (VI. 128. 60). Summoned by Râma, entered his presence-chamber and was duly received (VII. 74. 4-5). Consulted by Râma on the eve of the Horse Sacrifice (VII. 91. 2). Witnessed the oath-taking ceremony of Sîtâ at Râma's court (VII. 96.2).

KÂŚYAPA—a courtier of Râma who with light talks sought to divert his master (VII. 43. 2),

KINNARAS, THE—The Devas requested by Brahman to produce Vânara children on—girls (I. 17. 6). Followed the course of the Gaṅgâ (I. 43. 32). Some dwelt in the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha (I. 51. 23). Assembled to witness the duel between Râma and Paraśu-Râma (I. 76. 10). Their abodes on the Citrakūta hill (II. 93. 11). Pairs of wandering kinnaras shewn by Râma to Sîtâ (II. 94. 11). Their broad-swords hanging from the trees (II. 94 12). Râvaṇa saw the groves frequented by them (III. 35. 14). Frequented Râma's hermitage in the Daṇḍakas (III. 43. 12). Frequented Janasthâna (III. 67. 6). Râma found some wandering in the Pampâ regions (IV. 1. 61). Haunted the Lake Sudarśana for the sake of pleasure (IV. 40. 46). Horse-faced women frequented the Mainâka hills (V. 1. 6) (V. 1. 97). Haunted the Ariṣṭa hills (V. 56. 36). Left them when they sank under the weight of Hanumân (V. 56. 48). Assembled to witness the duel between Râma and Makarâkṣa (VI. 79. 25).

Complained when Râvaṇa seated on a chariot fought with Râma on foot (VI. 102. 5). Prayed for the safety of the cows and the Brâhmaṇas when Râma fought with Râvaṇa (VI. 107. 48-49). Frequented the banks of the Mandâkinî (VII. 11. 42). Sang in chorns love-songs on the Kailâsa hills (VII. 26. 7). Visited the Vindhyas with their women folk (VII. 31. 16). Ilā's companions turned into Kim-puruṣîs by Budha (VII. 88. 21-24).

KIRÂTAS, THE—Born of the pores in Śabalî's skin, they destroyed to a man Viśvâmitra's army. म्लेच्छाः (I. 55. 3—4).

KIṢKINDHÂ—a cave (I. 1. 67) where Sugrîva fought a duel with Vâlin (I. 1. 69). A town, at the gate of which Mâyâvin threw out the challenge to Vâlin (IV. 9. 5). Sugrîva returned there on the supposed death of Vâlin (IV. 9. 20). अतुलप्रभा (IV. 11. 21). The town of Vâlin (IV. 11. 24). Its gates scratched by the Asura Dundubhi with his horns (IV. 11. 27). Sugrîva accompanied by Râma etc. proceeded to—(IV. 12. 14). Did so again at the suggestion of Râma (IV. 12. 42). वालिविक्रमपालिता (IV. 13. 1). दुराधर्षा (IV. 13. 29). सुरेशात्मजवीर्यपालिता (IV. 13. 30). हरिवागुरया पूर्णा, काञ्चनभूषणा, ध्वजयन्त्राढ्या (IV. 14.5-6). नगरी (IV. 16.13). Defended by forts (IV. 19. 15). रम्या (IV. 26. 19). Situated in the cave of a hill (IV. 26. 41). चित्रकानना ; Situated near Prasravaṇa hill (IV. 27.26). बलाकीर्णा महापुरी दुर्गा (IV. 31.16). दुरासदा (IV. 31. 26). Surrounded by walls and moats (IV. 31. 27). Described (IV. 33. 4-8), (VI. 28. 30). Râma's Puṣpaka car passed by—(VI. 123. 23). Described (VII. 37 (a). 47—49).

KĪRTIRATHA—धर्मात्मा, son of Pratîndhaka, and father to Deva Mīḍa (I. 71. 9-10).

KĪRTIRÂTA—महाबलः, Son of Mahîdhraka, and father to Mahâromâ (I. 71. 11).

KUKṢI—(i) Son of Ikṣvâku and father to Vikukṣi. श्रीमान् (I. 70. 22).

(ii) A country in the west, rich in Punnâga, Bakula and Uddâlaka. Sugrîva sent Suṣeṇa etc. there in search of Sîtâ (IV. 42. 7).

KUÑJARA, THE—(i) A range of hills situated on the other side of the Vaidyaut hills. नेत्रमनःकान्तः At the top of which Viśvakarman built a mansion for Agastya and on which was situated Bhogavatî—the home of the serpents (IV. 41. 34-36). Sugrîva sent Aṅgada etc. there in search of Sîtâ (IV. 41. 38).

KUÑJARA—(ii) A Vânara chief whose daughter Añjanâ was the mother of Hanumân (IV. 66. 10).

KUTIKÂ, THE—a river crossed by Bharata on his return journey from Kekaya (II. 71. 15).

KUTIKOṢṬHIKA, THE—a river crossed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 10).

KUMUDA—a Vānara chief. Lakṣmaṇa passed by his house at Kiṣkindhâ (IV. 33. 11). Led the van of the invading army (VI. 4. 30). Formerly dwelt on the bank of the Gomatî, later on made himself master of the tree-clad Vindhya hills (VI. 26. 25—26). Set himself up at the eastern gate with 10 krors of followers (VI. 42. 23). Repaired where Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa were lying senseless (VI. 46. 3). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI. 47. 2—4). Did fearful carnage in the ranks of the Rākṣasa army (VI. 55. 30-32). Attacked Atikāya, but being defeated had to retire (VI. 71. 39-42). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 60). Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 20).

KUMBHA—A Rākṣasa chief whose house was burnt down by Hanumān (V. 54. 15). जीमूतनिकाशरूपः पृथुव्युढसुजातवक्षाः. Accompanied Rāvaṇa to the battle-field driving in a car and twanging his bow (VI. 59. 20). Son of

Kumbhakarṇa; sent by Rāvaṇa to carry on the fight (VI. 75. 44-46). Fought respectively with Dvivida, Mainda and Aṅgada, and disabled or wounded every one (VI. 76. 35-55). तेजस्वी (VI. 76. 37). धन्विनां श्रेष्ठः (VI. 76. 38). वीर्यवान् (VI. 76. 47). Stopped Jāmbavān etc. by discharging a flight of arrows at them (VI. 76. 60—62). Valiant like his father (VI. 76. 72). धनुषीन्द्रजितस्तुल्यः प्रतापे रावणस्य च। त्वमद्य रक्षसां लोके श्रेष्ठोऽसि बलबीर्यतः (VI. 76. 75). Fought a duel with Sugrīva in the course of which lost his bow and was flung into the sea, and at last killed (VI. 76. 63-93).

KUMBHAKARṆA—His death foreseen by Vālmîki प्रवृद्धनिद्रः, महाबलः (I. 3. 36). Brother to Śūrpanakhâ (III. 17. 22). His palace visited by Hanumān (V. 6. 18). Hanumān set fire to his house (V. 54. 14). महाबलः सर्वशस्त्रभृतां मुख्यः Slept for six months at a stretch (VI. 12. 11). On hearing Rāvaṇa's lamentations for Sîtâ (VI. 12. 7-26), took him to task for having abducted her on his own responsibility; later on promised to destroy the enemy so that he might enjoy the company of Sîtâ uninterrupted (VI. 12. 27-40). बीर्यवान् महातेजाः शक्रप्रतिबलः युधि (VI. 19. 10). अप्रतिमगाम्भीर्यः देवदानवदर्पहा, ब्रह्मशापाभिभूतः (VI. 60. 13 14). Slept for six months at a stretch (VI. 60. 17). ग्राम्यसुखे रतः (VI. 60. 19). भीमविक्रमः (VI. 60 26). भीमनासापुटः, पातालविपुलाननः मेदोरुधिरगन्धी (VI. 60. 29). नीलाञ्जनचयाकारः (VI. 60. 43). श्रातबलः (VI. 60. 59). The Râkṣasas having roused him from sleep after employing numerous artifices at the direction of Râvaṇa (VI. 60 14-21), enquired about the cause of that untimely awakening (VI. 60. 22-70). Hearing the report of Yūpâkṣa (VI. 60. 71-77), was so far moved that he offered to go straight to the battle-field to make an end of the invaders (VI. 60. 78-80). On being informed that Rāvaṇa wanted to see him (VI. 60.

88—89), washed his mouth, took his bath and food, then drank hard; thus being tipsy proceeded to Rāvaṇa's palace through the main thoroughfare (VI. 60. 90—95). तेजोबलसमन्वितः (VI. 60.93). कालान्तकयमोपमः (VI. 60.94). महाकायः (VI. 61.1). पर्वताकारदर्शनः (VI. 61.2). प्रकृत्या तेजस्वी (VI. 61. 12). Defeated Yama and Indra in the battle-field; son of Viśravā; in bulk excelled all Rākṣasas; defeated all living beings including the Devas; commenced devouring the living beings as soon as born; Indra being appealed to, struck him with the bolt, when he began to roar aloud; being angry beat Indra pulling out a tusk of his Airāvata; thus being oppressed the Devas headed by Indra approached Brahman who sending for the Rākṣasas declared that for the well-being of the world Kumbhakarṇa was to sleep on; then at the intercession of Rāvaṇa conceded that he was to wake up once in six months for a day only (VI. 61. 9–28). निद्रामदसमाकुलः (VI. 62. 1). परमदुर्जयः (VI. 62. 2). Passing through the road he entered Râvaṇa's palace; then being cordially received enquired about the cause of his urgent summons (VI. 62. 1-12). In reply to Rāvaṇa's appeal (VI. 62. 12-22), told that he had been misled by insincere counsellors and that Bibhîṣaṇa's and his prophecy have come to be too true (VI. 63. 1-21). In reply to Râvaṇa's words of protest (VI. 63. 22-27), promised to destroy and devour the enemies of Laṅkā (VI. 63.28-56), assured Rāvaṇa of his sure success in the battle-field and reproved Mahodara for his misplaced advice (VI. 65. 1-8). युद्धविशारदः (VI. 65. 10). At the desire of Râvaṇa (VI. 65. 11-14), picked up his terrible (शूल) weapon and offered to go alone to the battle-field leaving behind the army (VI. 65. 17-22). With the help of Râvaṇa put the ornaments and armours on, and then took leave of his brother (VI. 65. 25-32). Then he set forth at the head of a huge army consisting of charioteers, warriors and foot-soldiers, indulging in tall talks, disregarding the omens and magnifying his body to huge proportions, till stepping across the ramparts he stood before the Vânara army (VI. 65. 33-53). Roared aloud when he found the Vânaras panic-stricken (VI. 65. 55). Left the town stepping across the ramparts and then he bellowed out (VI. 66. 1–2). भीमाक्ष: (VI. 66. 3). The attacks delivered by the Vânaras could create no impression on him; destroyed the Vânara army right and left till they dispersed in confusion (VI. 66. 8-17). Rallied by Aṅgada when the Vânara army attacked him (VI. 67. 1-4), killed them mercilessly with his club and devoured them 16, 18 and 20 at a time (VI. 67. 5-7). With his शूल reduced to pieces the trees and stones flung by Hanumān (VI. 67. 16). Struck with a hill-top by Hanumān wounded him in return (VI. 67. 17-20). Reduced to pieces the huge stone flung at him by Nîla (VI. 67. 22-23). Killed or mortally wounded the five Vānara chiefs who attacked him (VI. 67. 24-29). Bitten, scratched, boxed and slapped by the Vânaras, ate them up and being routed they sought refuge with Rāma (VI. 67. 30-41). Fought a duel with Aṅgada and stunned him with a blow (VI. 67. 42-49). Fought a duel with Sugrīva in the course of which lost his शूल and made a captive of him, and carried him to Laṅkā (VI. 67. 51-71). While passing through the streets his nose and ears bitten off and the sides scratched by Sugrîva who slipped away from his hold; bathed in a pool of blood angrily retraced his steps to the battle field holding a club in his hand (VI. 67. 84-92). Rushing blindly into the thick of the Vānara army began devouring mercilessly and indiscriminately the Vânaras, Ṛkṣas and Râkṣasas, thus routing his opponents (VI. 67. 93-99). Baffled the arrows shot at him by Lakṣmaṇa (VI. 67. 102). Disregarding the arrow shots of

Lakṣmaṇa ironically praised his valour and expressed his intention to fight with Rāma; after his death, with others (VI. 67. 103-111). Lakṣmaṇa having pointed out Râma (VI. 67. 112-114), rushed at him leaving behind Lakṣmaṇa (VI. 67. 114-115). Being wounded by Râma (VI. 67. 116), made a rush at the Vānaras belching out fire; being disarmed, killed and devoured his foes and allies indiscriminately, then flung a huge hill-top at Rāma (VI. 67. 117-123). Indignantly shook off the Vānaras who had climbed on him at the word of command from Lakṣmaṇa (VI. 67. 130-131). Fought a contested duel with Râma in the course of which he was killed (VI. 67.141-170).

Second son of Viśravā and Kaikasî (VII. 9. 34). Roamed about the three worlds devouring the sages (VII. 9. 38). Practised austerities for 10,000 years (VII. 10. 3-5). In reply to Brahman's offer (VII. 10.43-44) prayed that he might sleep on for years to come (VII. 10.44-45). Repented when the Devas disappeared (VII. 10. 46-48). Married to Vajrajvâlâ (VII. 12. 23-24). Sometime later feeling sleepy, asked Râvaṇa to build a separate mansion for him; when it was ready, slept there for thousands of years (VII. 13. 1-7). On the occasion of Râvaṇa's struggle with Indra fought with the Rudras (VII. 28. 34-36).

KUMBHAHANU—An officer of the Rākṣasa Lord Prahasta, who followed his chief to the battle-field (VI. 57. 30). Slaughtered the Vānaras mercilessly (VI. 58. 19). Killed by Aṅgada (VI. 58. 23).

KUMBHĪNASĪ—Her husband Madhu वीर्योत्सिक्तः दुरासदः दानवेन्द्रः was defeated by Rāvaṇa (VI. 7. 8). Daughter of Sumālin & Ketumatī (VII. 5. 38-40). Abducted by Madhu (VII. 25. 19). Interceding with Rāvaṇa on behalf of her husband, helped to form an alliance between them (VII. 25. 39-48).

KURU—A country in the north to which Sugrīva sent Śatabala in search of Sītā (IV. 43. 11).

KURUS, THE UTTARA,—In those lands was situated Kuvera's garden, the trees of which put forth leaves in the form of clothes and ornaments, and fruits in the shape of women (II. 91. 19). The rivers and forests of that country appeared in the hermitage of Bharadvāja (II. 91. 81). Abounding with trees that yield fruits and sweet juice throughout the year (III. 73. 7). कृतपुण्यप्रतिश्रया: Rich in rivers, tanks, forests of blue lotuses, river-banks studded with gold, gems and precious stones, hills clad in trees that yield fruits throughout the year. Peopled by the Gandharvas, Kinnaras etc and the holy people. The land of pleasure and pastime (IV. 43. 38-52). Sugrîva sent the Vānara chiefs there in search of Sītā (IV. 43. 53).

KURUJĀṄGALA—Vasiṣṭha's messengers on their way to Kekaya passed through this land (II. 68. 13).

KULA—A courtier of Rāma who with light talks sought to divert his master (VII. 43. 2).

KULIṄGĀ—(i) A town situated between the Śaradaṇḍa and the Ikṣumatī (II. 68. 16).

(ii) A river crossed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya. Rapid, pleasant and choked with hills (II. 71. 6).

KUVERA—In accordance with the desire of Brahman produced Gandhamādana (I. 17. 12). Rāvaṇa's brother and son of Viśravā (I. 20. 18). धनद: His protection invoked by Kausalyā during Rāma's exile (II. 25. 23). His gardens in the Uttara Kurus were asked by Bharadvāja to help him in entertaining the army of Bharata (II. 91. 19). Sent 20,000 girls in response (II. 91. 44). Pronounced an imprecation on Tumburu the Gandharva that he was to assume the form of Virâdha, for his excessive attachment for Rambhā; when his wrath went down assured the accursed one that he would assume his own shape when killed by Râma (III. 4. 16-19). वैश्रवणः (III. 4. 16). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Râma (III. 12. 18). Defeated by Râvaṇa and his Puṣpaka car was captured by him (III. 32. 14-15). नरवाहनः (III. 32. 14). Brother of Râvaṇa (III. 35. 7; III. 48. 2). Being defeated retired to the Kailâsa hills (III. 48. 4-5). सर्वदेवनमस्कृतः (III. 48. 21). His beautiful palace on the Kailâsa built by Viśvakarman (IV. 43. 21.). Whiled away his time playing with the Guhyakas on the banks of the tank situated near his palace. यक्षराट् (IV. 43. 22-23). भूतेशः द्रविणाधिपतिः (VI. 4. 19). धनपः (VI. 7. 4). Gloried in the fact that he was a friend of Maheśvara. लोकपालः महाबलः (VI. 7. 5). Appeared before Râma and admonished him for ill-treating Sîtâ (VI. 117. 2-9). Son of the Ṛṣi Viśravâ and Deva Varṇinî वीर्यसम्पन्नः परमाद्भुतः अपत्यः, सर्वैः ब्रह्मगुणैः वृतः (VII. 3. 1-6). Called Vaiśravaṇa by the great Ṛṣi Pulastya (VII. 3. 6-8). Retiring to a forest practised austerities for thousands of years (VII. 3. 9-12). In reply to Brahman's offer (VII. 3. 13-14) prayed for guardianship of the world (VII. 3. 15). प्रयतः आत्मवान् (VII. 3. 22). Being appointed one of the guardians of the world by Brahman (VII. 3. 16-21) requested his father to name a spot where he could live happily (VII. 3. 22-23). In accordance with his father's advice (VII. 3. 24-30) took possession of Laṅkâ and ruled happily over the Rākṣasas. Thence driving in the Puṣpaka, he used to pay visits to his father and mother (VII. 3. 31-35). वित्तपालः (VII. 11. 26). सर्वशस्त्रभृतां वरः (VII. 11. 27). वाक्यविदां वरः (VII. 11. 30). In reply to Prahasta's words of negotiation (VII. 11. 25-29). said that he was ever ready to restore Laṅkā to his brother, Rāvaṇa;

then calling on his father asked his opinion (VII. 11. 30-35). In compliance with his father's desire (VII. 11. 36-43), retired to the Kailāsa hills (VII. 11. 44). Continued to dwell on the beautiful Kailāsa hills (VII. 11. 50). On hearing the report of tyranny practised by Rāvaṇa (VII. 13. 8-10) sent an ambassador to warn him (VII. 13. 11-12). While observing penances on the Himālayas, happened to look at Umā, hence lost his left eye; then retiring to other parts practised austerities for 800 years—thereby became a close friend of Mahā Deva and received the name of एकाक्षिपिंगली (VII. 13. 21-31). On the defeat of the Yakṣas, sent out the Yakṣakas to fight against Rāvaṇa (VII. 14. 20). On the defeat of the Yakṣas sent out Maṇi Bhadra (VII. 15. 1-2). Faced Rāvaṇa club in hand and scolded him and fought with him till over-whelmed by Rāvaṇa by magic was badly hurt (VII. 15. 16-33). Carried to the Nandana Park for treatment (VII. 15. 34). Attended the sacrificial session of King Marutta, but assumed the form of a chameleon for fear of Rāvaṇa (VII. 18. 4-5). On the departure of Rāvaṇa came out of his place of refuge and offered boons (VII. 18. 32-34). On the recommendation of Brahman (VII. 36. 7-9) made Hanumān proof against his club (VII. 36. 17).

KUŚA—A Brāhmaṇa by birth. महान्, महातपाः, अक्लिष्टव्रतधर्मज्ञः सज्जनप्रतिपूजकः (I. 32.1). महात्मा Begot four sons Kuśāmba, Kuśanābha, Asūrta Rajas and Vasu on Vaidarbhī who came of a noble family (I. 32. 2-3). Asked his sons to undertake the work of protection (I. 32. 4). Appeared in the Putreṣṭi sacrifice of Kuśanābha and foretold the birth of a son (I. 34. 2-3). Disappeared in the heavens (I. 34. 4). परमोदारः ब्रह्मसुतः (I. 34. 2). Son of Prajāpati (I. 51. 18).

KUŚADHVAJA—Younger brother of Janaka. महातेजाः वीर्यवान्, अतिधार्मिकः (I. 70 2). Resided in the city of

Śāṅkāśya on the river Ikṣumatī. Constant protector of Janaka's sacrifices. Sent for to share his joy (I. 70. 3-6). On his arrival paid his respects to Janaka and S'atānanda, and then took a seat (I. 70. 7-10). नरव्याघ्रः (I. 70. 6) अमितद्युतिः (I. 70. 10). वीरः (I, 70. 11). Younger son of Hrasva Roma (I. 71. 13). Placed under the guardianship of Janaka when his father retired from the world (I. 71. 14). देवसंकाशः (I 71. 15). On the defeat and death of Sudhanvan of Sāṅkāśya, placed on the throne by Janaka (I. 71. 16-20).

KUŚADHVAJA—Father of Vedavatī ब्रह्मर्षिः अमितप्रभः son of Vṛhaspati, श्रीमान्. in wisdom equalled his father. Daily studied the Vedas. In his intense desire to marry his daughter to Viṣṇu rejected the offer of all beings till killed by the Daitya Śambhu one night (VII. 17. 8-13).

KUŚANĀBHA—Son of Kuśa and Vaidarbhī (I. 32. 2). According to his father's wishes undertook to perform the duties of a Kṣattriya (I. 32 4). धर्मात्मा Founded the town of Mahodaya (I. 32. 6). राजर्षिः Had a hundred daughters by Ghṛtācī (I. 32. 11). Finding his daughters deformed (I. 32. 23), enquired about the cause (I. 32. 25-26). धीमान् (I. 33. 1). परमधार्मिकः महातेजाः (I. 33. 5). On hearing their story (I. 33. 1-4), dismissed them extolling the quality of forgiveness (I. 33. 5-9). त्रिदशविक्रमः (I. 33. 9). मन्त्रज्ञः consulted his counsellors about giving away his daughters in marriage (I. 33. 10). Decided to marry his daughters to Brahmadatta (I. 33. 20). सुधार्मिकः Sent for him and did so (I. 33. 21). Was greatly pleased to find his daughters cured (I. 33. 24). Dismissed his daughters in the company of Brahmadatta and priests (I. 33. 25). Praised highly by the Gandharbī Somadā (I. 33. 26). Going without a son, celebrated the Putreṣṭi Sacrifice (I. 34. 1). On that occasion appeared Kuśa who prophecied the birth of a son, named Gādhi (I. 34. 2—3). Shortly after this, was born Gādhi (I. 34. 5). बलवान्, सुधार्मिकः (1. 51. 18).

HIS HUNDRED DAUGHTERS—Born of Ghṛtācī (I. 32. 11). यौवनशालिन्यः, रूपवत्यः, स्वलंकृताः, आभरणभूषिताः Were disporting themselves in the garden one day, when Vāyu made advances to them (I. 32. 12-17). Being rejected (I. 32. 18-22) Vāyu broke their limbs by entering their bodies (I. 32. 23). गुणसम्पन्नाः रूपयौवनसंयुताः (I. 32. 15). With broken limbs entered the palace distracted, abashed and with eyes full of tears (I. 32. 24). परमशोभनाः (I. 32. 25). In reply to the father's enquiries (I. 32. 25-26), related their sad story (I. 33. 1-4). Married to Brahma Datta by their father (I. 33. 22). Relieved of their deformities as soon as touched by him (I. 33. 23). Accompanied their husband to his home (I. 33. 25). Received warmly by Somadā (I. 33 26).

KUŚAPLAVA—Where Diti practised austerities for a thousand years (I. 46. 8) tended by Indra (I. 46. 9). Near about Vaiśālī (I. 47. 10—11).

KUŚĀVATĪ—Capital of Kuśa, built by Rāma at the foot of the Vindhya Hills. रम्या नगरी (VII. 108. 4).

KUŚĀMBA—Son of Kuśa and Vaidarbhī (I. 32. 2). In accordance with his father's desire, undertook the duties of a Kṣattriya (I. 32. 4). महातेजाः Founded Kauśāmbī (I. 32. 6).

KAUŚĀMBI—A town founded by Kuśa (I. 32. 6).

KUŚAŚVA—Of the royal house of Viśālā, son of Sahadeva परमधार्मिकः (I. 47. 15). His son was Somadatta (I. 47. 16).

KUŚĪ—Being remembered appeared before Vālmiki (I. 4. 4). मुनिवेशः, धर्मज्ञः, राजपुत्रः, यशस्वी, स्वरसम्पन्नः, आश्रम-

वासी (I. 4. 5). मेधावी, वेदेषु परिनिष्ठितः (I. 4. 6). गान्धर्वतत्त्वज्ञः, स्थानमूर्च्छनकोविदः, गन्धर्व इव रूपी (I. 4. 10). रूपलक्षणसंपन्नः, मधुरस्वरभाषी, बिम्बादिवोत्थितः बिम्बः रामदेहात्तथा परः (I. 4. 11). अनिन्दितः (I. 4. 12). तत्त्वज्ञः सुसमाहितः (I. 4. 13). महात्मा, महाभागः, सर्वलक्षणलक्षितः (I. 4. 14). His songs moved the assembly of Ṛṣis and Muṇis so much, that they appreciated them with suitable gifts (I. 4. 16-27). सर्वगीतिषु कोविदः (I. 4. 27). Rāma sent for him, thus honoring him (I. 4. 29-30). रूपसम्पन्नः विनीतः (I. 4. 31). देववर्चाः (I. 4. 32). Sang the Rāmāyaṇa in Rāma's court (I. 4. 33-34). पार्थिवलक्षणान्वितः महातपस्वी (I. 4. 35). Born of Sîtā at the hermitage of Vālmîki (VII. 66. 1-11). अरिन्दमः At the desire of Vālmîki (VII. 93. 1-16) anxiously waited for the day-break (VII. 93. 17-18). Next morning began to sing songs (VII. 94. 1). Being sent for by Rāma (VII. 94. 1-9), sang in open court (VII. 94. 10-16). Declined to accept the gift of money offered by Rāma (VII. 94. 19-20). To satisfy Rāma's curiosity (VII. 94. 22-23), described in detail the arrangement, size and authorship of the Poem ; and promised to recite the whole poem before him, when he would become free (VII. 94. 24-28). Withdrew (VII. 94. 29). Retired in Rāma's apartment (VII. 98. 27). At Rāma's desire (VII. 99. 1), sang the latter portion of the Rāmāyaṇa (VII. 99. 2). Made King of Kośala (VII. 107. 17-19).

KṚTTIKĀS, THE—appointed by Indra and the Maruts, fed the new-born babe Kārtịkeya on their breasts (I. 37. 23-24). The milk that gushed forth from the breasts of the six—was, sucked by the six mouths of Kārtikeya (I. 37. 28).

KṚŚĀŚVA—Married the daughters of Dakṣa who produced the divine weapons to destroy the Asuras with. King Viśvāmitra came by them (I. 21. 13). The Devas headed by Indra requested Viśvāmitra to pass them on to Rāma on the destruction of Tāṭakā (I. 26. 29). The mysteries re. the weapons transmitted to Rāma by the great Ṛṣi (I. 28. 10).

KṚṢṆAGIRI, THE—Hills. Frequented by Rambha, the Vānara chief (VII. 26. 30).

KṚṢṆAVEṆĪ, THE—A river in the South. Sugrîva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 9).

KEKAYA—The Rājā of—with his son invited to attend the Horse Sacrifice. Father-in-law of Daśaratha **वृद्धः परमधार्मिकः** (I. 13. 24). Delighted to see Bharata (I. 77. 20). For want of time Daśaratha could not send for him when he intended consecrating Rāma as the Crown Prince (II. 1. 48). His name was Aśvapati (II. 9. 22). By favor of Brahman acquired the Science of reading the thoughts of birds and beasts. One day he having laughed at a Jṛmbha bird, his wife insisted on hearing the cause of his laughter. But as disclosure meant death to him, refused to do so. His wife—Kaikeyī's mother, having proved obstinate, rejected her (II. 35. 18-26). Bharata and Śatrughna were in—at the time of Daśaratha's death (II. 67. 7). Messengers despatched for–(II. 68. 10). [See Aśvapati in this connection.]

KETUMATĪ—Second daughter of Narmadā the Gandharvī married to Sumālin. **पूर्णचन्द्रनिभानना प्राणेभ्योऽपि गरीयसी** Brought forth Prahasta, Akampana etc. (VII.5.37-40).

KERALA—A country in the South, Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 12).

KEŚINĪ—Daughter of the Rājā of Vidarbha, elder queen of Sagara. **धर्मिष्ठा सत्यवादिनी** (I. 38. 3). Practised austerities along with her husband and co-wife in the Himālayas for a hundred years (I. 38. 5-6). In fulfilment of a boon granted by Bhṛgu gave birth to a son called Asamañja (I. 38. 16). Her devotion to Sagara referred to (V. 24. 12).

KEŚINĪ, The—a river, on the bank of which Lakṣmaṇa and Sumantra spent a night (VII. 51. 29). Half a day's journey from Ayodhyā (VII. 52. 2).

KESARIN—Father of Hanūmān. In response to Sugrīva's call supplied many thousands of Vānaras (IV. 39. 18). Married to Añjanā, the doomed Apsarā (IV. 66. 8). Hanūmān was his क्षेत्रज son (IV. 66. 29). Killed the Asura Sambasādana on the sea-coast under instructions from the Devarṣis while going to Mt. Go-karṇa from Mt. Mālyavān (V. 35. 79-80). Defended the flank of the invading army with his followers (VI. 4. 33). Lived on the Kāñcana Parvata (VI, 27. 34-38). क्षेत्रज son of Gadgada begotten by Vṛhaspati (VI. 30. 21). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 59). Reigned in the Sumeru Hills (VII. 35. 19). Had Añjanā for his wife (VII. 35. 20). Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 20).

KAIKEYĪ—On seeing the arrangements made for appointing Rāma as Prince-regent asks for the fulfilment of the promised boons–viz. the exile of Rāma in favour of Bharata (I. 1. 21-22). Her mischievous intention foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 12). Was given a quarter part of the divine food offered to Daśaratha by the Prājāpatya man (I. 16. 28). Conceived in no time (I. 16. 31). Gave birth to Bharata. (I. 18. 13). Her brother Yudhājit came to see her (I. 73. 4). Received the brides with due ceremonies. सुमध्यमा (I. 17. 10-12).

On the eve of Rāma's coronation reproached by Mantharā for remaining blind to her interests (II. 7. 13-15). Enquired about the cause of her disquietitude (II. 7. 17).

On learning that Rāma was going to be appointed crown prince made gifts of ornaments to her and offered to give her more (II. 7. 31-36). शुभानना (II. 7. 31). प्रमदोत्तमा (II. 7. 33). In reply to Mantharā's accusations praised Rāma's inborn qualities, admitted his right to the throne and wondered why the slave girl should be so unquiet, and hoped that Bharata would succeed Rāma after a hundred years (II. 8. 13-19). At last Mantharā's specious pleadings (II. 8. 21-39) produced the desired effect on Kaikeyī's mind. She flared up in anger and asked Mantharā to tell her the ways and means that would secure the banishment of Rāma and enthronement of Bharata (II. 9. 1-3). विलासिनी (II. 9. 7). Out of curiosity raised herself up on the bed to listen to the words of Mantharā and requested her to suggest the ways and means (II. 9. 8-9). Saved the life of Daśaratha while he was fighting with Śambara as an ally of Indra. Pleased with her he offered to grant her two boons which she put off for the future (II. 9. 11-17). The favorite wife of Daśaratha for whose sake he could even enter the fire and for whom he could sacrifice his life (II. 9. 24-25). Praised Mantharā for giving her that precious suggestion (II. 9. 38-52). परमदर्शना (II. 9. 38). Acting on the advice of Mantharā she proceeded towards the Retiring-room (क्रोधागार), cast off all her ornaments and lay down on the bare ground and promised to die in that position if her demands were not fulfilled (II. 9. 55-59). विशालाक्षी सौभाग्यमदगर्विता (II. 9. 55). Promised not to stir until and unless her demands were satisfied and remained lying on the bare ground darkening her face with anger (II. 9. 62-66). भामिनी (II. 9. 65). Daughter of Aśvapati (II. 9. 22). On being tutored by the haunch-backed girl laid herself down on the bare ground like a Kinnarī struck with a poisoned arrow (II. 10. 1). Laid bare her plans to Mantharā. विचक्षणा (II. 10. 2). Thought of the ways and means of executing her plan (II. 10. 3-4). Then having fixed on the line of her action laid herself down on the ground with knitted brows and scattered the garland and the ornaments round the floor (II. 10. 6-7). Clad in dirty clothes and having arranged her hair in a single braid she confined herself in the Retiring-room (क्रोधागार) (II. 10. 8-9). Never before used to absent herself from her quarters at the time when the King withdrew from the court (II. 10. 18-19). Seen by Daśaratha lying on bare ground (II. 10. 22-23). वृद्धस्य तरुणी भार्या प्राणेभ्योऽपि गरीयसी (II. 10. 23). पापसंकल्पा लतेव विनिष्कृता पतिता देवतेव (II. 10. 24). किन्नरीव निर्धूता च्युताप्सराः यथा मायेव परिभ्रष्टा हरिणीव संयता (II. 10. 25). करेणु इव दिग्धेन मृगयुना वने विद्धा (II. 10. 26). कमलपत्राक्षी (II. 10. 27). भीरु, शोभना (II. 10. 39). In reply to Daśaratha's attempts to appease her wrath (II. 10. 28-39) told him that neither had any body insulted her nor was she outdone by any one and proposed to him to make a solemn promise if he wanted to fulfil her desire (II. 11. 2-3). Daśaratha having done so (II. 11. 5-10), Kaikeyī called on all the gods to witness the promise made by the king (II. 11. 13-16). Then after reminding him of the promised boons, demanded, their fulfilment viz. that he was to banish Rāma for 14 years in the Daṇḍaka forest and to instal Bharata instead on the throne (II. 11. 18-29). Reproached Daśaratha for hesitating to fulfil his promises and remained unmoved in spite of his appeals (II. 12. 38-50). नयसम्पन्ना (II. 12. 19). Many a time, said Daśaratha, she had treated Rāma as dearly as Bharata (II. 12. 21). Regarded as mother by Rāma (II. 12. 8). But twitted Daśaratha for being proud of his truthfulness and asked why he was hesitating to fulfil his promise (II. 13. 3). सुश्रोणी (II. 13. 21). असितापांगा गुरुश्रोणी (II. 13. 23). दुष्टभावा नृशंसा (II.13.24). प्रतिकूलभाषिणी (II. 13. 25). Abused by the people (II. 13. 25). Addressing the king lying in a state of torper she said that he must not lie on bare ground in that condition; for will he nill he, he had to fulfil the promise, then citing the examples of Śaibya, Alarka and the Ocean exhorted him to honour the word plighted and threatened to commit suicide if Rāma was not banished (II. 14. 2-10). पापा (II. 14. 1). On the death of Daśaratha she was not to perform the Tarpaṇa ceremony as the king finally forsook her (II. 14. 14; 17). वाक्यज्ञा पापसमाचारा (II. 14. 20). Insisted on her demands and asked the king to send for Rāma (II. 14. 21-22). मन्त्रज्ञा (II. 14. 59). Asked Sumantra to fetch the Prince at once (II. 14. 60-61). Rāma found her seated with Daśaratha (II. 18. 1). Greeted by Rāma (II. 18 2). In reply to Rāma's enquiries about the cause of Dasaratha's grief (II. 18. 10-18), told him that she would disclose it, if he promised to carry out the wishes of his father ungrudgingly (II. 18. 20-26). सुनिलज्जा (II. 18. 19). अनार्या (II. 18. 31). When Rāma had promised to do so (II. 18. 27-30) she bluntly told him that to fulfil his father's promise, he was to retire to the Daṇḍakas for 14 years, allowing Bharata to rule the earth in his place (II. 18. 32-40). In order to expedite his departure, told Rāma that Bharata would be brought there without delay and that he should immediately start and that the king was ashamed to tell him that he would neither bathe nor eat till he had taken his departure (II. 19. 12-16). अनार्या (II. 19. 19). Honored by Rāma (II. 19. 28-29). खरवादिनी (II. 20. 44). Never before made any distinction between her own son and Rāma (II. 22. 17). प्रकृतिसम्पन्ना राजपुत्री As fate would have it, used words befitting an uncultured person in the presence of the king (II. 22. 19). Rāma feared that she might not treat her co-wives well when she comes in possession of the throne (II. 31. 13). Abused by the people (II. 13. 82—85).

Instigated Daśaratha to deport Rāma without delay (II. 34. 30). भस्माग्निकल्पा स्त्री (II. 34. 36). वृत्तसादिनी (II. 34. 37). Did not melt when Daśaratha fell down senseless (II. 34. 61). पतिघ्नी कुलघ्नी (II. 35. 6). पापदर्शिनी (II 35. 27). Sumantra's admonitions (II, 35. 4-36), fell on deaf ears (II. 35. 37). Afraid lest Rāma should be provided with all the necessaries and comforts of life by Daśaratha (II. 36. 1-9), exclaimed that Bharata might not care to become the king with an empty treasury (II. 36. 10-12). मुक्तलज्जा आयतलोचना (II. 36. 13). Being angry she proposed that Rāma should be banished empty-handed like Asamañja—the eldest son of Sagara (II. 36. 15-16). वराङ्गना (II. 36. 15). Daśaratha's exclamation abashed all present but it could not affect the heart of Kaikeyī (II. 36. 17). Supplied the barks to Rāma etc. with her own hands. निरपत्रपा (II. 37. 6). Scolded by Vasiṣṭha (II. 37. 22–36). कुलपांसिनी (II. 37.22). शीलवर्जिता (II. 37. 23). दुर्वृत्ता (II. 37. 28). Held the left arm of the fainting king (II. 42. 4). All relations with her repudiated by the king (II. 42. 6–8). Cursed by Daśaratha (II. 42. 21). Kausalyā afraid of her (II. 43. 2-5). Abused by the ladies of Ayodhyā (II. 48. 21-25). निर्घृणा, अधर्म्या, दुष्टचारिणी (II. 48. 24). Cursed by the country-folk. नृशंसा, पापा, पापानुबन्धिनी, तीक्ष्णा (II. 49. 5). Sumantra deplored the fact that they had been placed under her rule. पापा (II. 52. 19.) Sumantra entrusted by Rāma to carry a message to her (II. 52. 30). Rama's object in sending away Sumantra was to convince her of his sincertity so that she might not accuse Daśaratha of faithlessness (II. 52. 61-62). Her mischievous designs remembered by Rāma (II. 53. 6-7; 14-15; 18). सौभाग्यमदमोहिता (II. 53. 15). क्षुद्रकर्मा (II. 53. 18). Rāma's parting message to Kausalyā that she should try to bring about reconcilation between Kaikeyī and Daśaratha reported by Sumantra (II. 58.19). पापाभिजनभावा (II. 59. 18). Cursed by Daśaratha at the moment of his death (II. 64. 77). Came weeping to the apartment where Daśaratha had died (II. 65. 25). Scolded by Kausalyā on the death of Daśaratha (II. 66. 3–6.). नृशंसा, दुष्टचारिणी (II. 66. 3). त्यक्तलज्जा (II. 66. 5). Condemned by her co wives (II. 66. 19-22), by the citizens (II. 66. 29). Her welfare enquired about by Bharata. आत्मकामा सदा चण्डी क्रोधना प्राज्ञमानिनी (II. 70. 10). When Bharata drew near stood up leaving her seat (II. 72. 2). Having caressed him enquired about the welfare of her father and brother, the journey and his experiences (II. 72. 4-6). राज्यलोभेन मोहिता (II. 72. 14). In reply to Bharata's enquiries regarding his father (II. 72. 11-13) informed him about his death (II. 72. 15). Consoled her child in suitable words (II. 72. 24-25). In reply to Bharata's enquiries (II. 72. 34-35), repeated the last words of the dying king (II. 72. 36-38), and informed him that Rāma etc. had been banished through no fault of his but as a result of her own asking. Then she requested Bharata to occupy the throne after performing the last rites of his father (II. 72. 48-54). चपला (II. 72. 46). वृथापण्डितमानिनी (II. 72. 47). Scolded by Bharata, for bringing about the death of Daśaratha and the exile of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (II. 73. 2-27). पुत्रगर्द्धिनी (II. 73. 17). साधुचारित्रविभ्रष्टा (II. 73. 19). सुमहाभागा (II. 73. 24). Cursed and abused by Bharata (II. 74. 2-12). राज्यकामुका दुर्वृत्ता पतिघातिनी (II. 74. 7). कुलदूषिणी (II. 74. 8). पितुः कुलप्रध्वंसिनी (II. 74. 9). Condemned by Bharata to death or retirement from the world (II. 74. 33). क्रूरकार्या (II. 75. 6). Being taken to task by Śatrughna, sought refuge with Bharata out of fear (II. 78. 19-20). In a suppressed voice consoled Mantharā (II. 78. 26). Accompanied Bharata to bring back Rāma (II. 83.6). Nursed Bharata when he fell into a swoon

उपवासकृशा, दीना, भर्तृव्यसनकर्शिता (II. 87. 6). The straw-bed on which Rāma lay, pointed out by Bharata (II. 88. 2). Boarded the boat supplied by Guha (II. 89. 13). Bowed down to Bharadvāja and bashfully stood close to Bharata (II. 92. 17-18). Introduced by Bharata to Bharadvāja (II. 92. 25-27). क्रोधना, अकृतप्रज्ञा, दृप्ता, सुभगमानिनी, ऐश्वर्यकामा, अनार्या आर्यरूपिणी (II. 92. 26). Rāma made enquiries about her of Bharata (II. 100. 10). Bharata reproved by Rāma for having used uncharitable remarks against her (II. 101. 17-22). Abused by the retinue of Bharata which went to meet Rāma (II. 103. 46). Rāma charged Bharata to treat her with due regard (II. 112. 19; 27-28).

दीर्घदर्शिनी (III. 2. 19). Lakṣmaṇa spoke ill of her, क्रूरदर्शिनी (III. 16. 35) for which he is admonished by Rāma (III. 16. 37–38). Her part in bringing about the banishment of Rāma is described by Sītā to Rāvaṇa (III. 47. 6-22). Daśaratha excused her at the request of Rāma (VI. 119. 24-26). Took an active part in Śatrughna's coronation (VII. 63. 16-17). Expired (VII. 99. 15).

KAIKASĪ—शुचिस्मिता Daughter of Sumālin and Katumatī (VII. 5. 38-40). साक्षाद् श्रीरिव. (VII. 9. 9). In compliance with her father's wishes (VII. 9. 7-13) approached Viśravā Ṛṣi and stood hesitatingly in his presence. सुश्रोणी पूर्णचन्द्रनिभानना (VII. 9. 14-17). स्वतेजसा दीप्यमाना (VII. 9. 18). In reply to Viśravā's enquiry (VII. 9. 18) replied that she had come to him at the desire of her father and that her business had to be divined by him (VII. 9. 19-20). मत्तमातंगगामिनी (VII. 9. 22). In reply to his prediction (VII. 9. 21-24) asked him to revise his decision as she hardly expected such cruel sons from him (VII. 9. 24-25). In course of time gave birth to Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa, Śūrpanakhā and Bibhīṣaṇa

(VII. 9. 28-36). Once seeing Kuvera exhorted Rāvaṇa to try to attain his brother's status (VII. 9. 40-43).

KAIṬABHA—a Daitya, killed by Viṣṇu with an invisible arrow (VII. 63. 22). (VII. 69. 26). The Earth with its hills was made out of his bones (VII. 104. 6).

KAILĀSA HILLS, the—On which is situated the Mānasa Lake (I. 24. 8). धातुमण्डितः ; The Devas approached Agni at—(I. 37. 10). The dwelling place of Kuvera—invaded by Rāvaṇa (III. 32. 14). Sugrīva asked Hanumān to send for the Vānaras residing there (IV. 37. 2). 1000 Krors came thence (IV. 37. 22). Across a wilderness to the north of the Deva-Sakhā Hills. पाण्डुरः Sugrīva asked Śatabala to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 43. 20). Rāvaṇa's visit described (VII. 25. 52ff).

KOŚALA—The country through which flowed the Sarayū. मुदितः स्फीतः महान् जनपदः प्रभूतधनधान्यवान् (I. 5. 5). Bhānumān, the Rājā of—(I. 13. 26), Daśaratha offered the produce of—to appease the wrath of Kaikeyī (II. 10.37—38). The borders crossed by the exiled Rāma (II. 49. 8). Prosperity of the villages (II. 50. 8—10). Sugrīva asked Vinata to go to—in search of Sītā (IV. 40. 22). Divided into two halves by Rāma: Kuśa ruled over—; while Lava ruled over the Uttara Kośala (VII. 107. 17).

KOṢA-KĀRAS; THE LAND OF—Silk-producing districts. Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sītā (IV. 40. 23).

KAUŚIKA—A Ṛṣi of the east who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 2).

KAUŚIKA—A country in the South. Sugrīva asked Aṅgada to go there in search of Sitā (IV. 41. 11).

KAUŚIKĪ, the—Viśvāmitra's elder sister Satyavatī born as a river on the death of her husband Ṛcīka (I.34.7—8). Issues from the Himālayâs for the good of the world.

दिव्या पुष्पोदका रम्या (I. 34. 9). सरितां वरा (I. 34. 11). Viśvāmitra practised austerities on its bank for a thousand years (I. 63. 15). सरितां श्रेष्ठा कुलोद्योतकरी (I. 34. 21). Sugrīva asked Vinata to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 40. 20).

KAUṢEYA—A great Ṛṣi of the west who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 4).

KAUSALYĀ—Mother of Rāma (I. 1. 17). Was initiated with Daśaratha to the Aśvamedha (I. 13. 41). Attended carefully the horse and struck him with three swords (I. 14. 33). Spent a night with him (I. 14. 34). Was joined by the priests to the horse (I. 14. 35). Was given a half of the rice cooked in milk given to the king by the Prājāpatya man (I. 16. 27). Conceived in no time (I. 16. 31). After 12 months gave birth to Rāma (I. 18. 8—10). Appeared resplendent with Rāma like Aditi on the birth of Indra (I. 18. 12). Received the bride Sītā according to the prescribed rites. सुमध्यमा (I. 17. 10—12).

Shone glorious on account of the lustre of his son, like Aditi on account of Indra, the wielder of the Vajra (II. 1. 8). Distributed gold, cows etc. among the friends who carried to her the good news re. Rāma's approaching coronation (II. 3. 47—48). सदृशी ज्येष्ठा पत्नी (II. 3. 39) Clad in linens offered prayers to Viṣṇu when informed about Rama's coronation by Lakṣmaṇa and Sumitrā (II. 4. 30—33). Showered benedictions on Rāma (II. 4. 38—41). Kaikeyī accused Daśaratha of entertaining a desire to enjoy with Kausalyā at the sacrifice of his duty (II. 12. 45). Daśaratha is at a loss to offer an explanation to her about the cause of Rāma's banishment (II. 12. 67—68). दासीव च सखीव च भार्यावद्भगिनीवच्च मातृवच्च; प्रियकामा प्रियपुत्रा प्रियंवदा (II. 12. 68—69). Never loved by Daśaratha for fear of Kaikeyī (II. 12. 70). Sure to die if she lost her husband and was separated from Rāma (II. 12. 89). When Rāma approached her to inform her about his impending banishment she was worshipping the gods for his welfare (II. 20. 14—19). **पुत्रहितैषिणी** (II. 20 14). **हृष्टा नित्यं व्रतपरायणा** (II. 20. 15). **व्रतयोगेन कर्शिता, वरवर्णिनी** (II. 20. 19). Received her son affectionately, showered blessings on him then offered him a seat and invited him to dinner (II. 20. 20—25). Fell sensless on the ground at Rāma's words (II. 20. 33). Nursed tenderly by Rāma (II. 20. 34). Complained loudly in the presence of Lakṣmaṇa about the ill-treatment meted out to her by Daśaratha and her co-wives, said that separation from Rāma would certainly cause her death, wondered why she had not died while Rāma was communicating the news to her and expressed her desire to follow Rāma to the forests (II. 20. 36—55). On the conclusion of Lakṣmaṇa's speech (II. 21. 1—19) asked Rāma to do what he thought best : said that as his mother she had as much right to claim devotion from him as his father ; that his separation would cause her death and that if he went away without her consent she would take to starvation (II. 21. 20—28). Fell senseless on the ground when Rāma did not yield (II. 21. 51). Then addressing Rāma she said that death was preferable to separation from him and advanced a mother's claim on her child (II. 21. 52—53). Finding Rāma determined to retire to the forests she wanted to accompany him (II. 24. 1—9). She consented to remain at home while Rāma reminded her of the duty she owed to her husband. **शुभदर्शना** (II. 24. 14). She again asked Rāma to take her with him as her life in the midst of co-wives would be miserable. **सुतवत्सला** (II. 24. 18—20). At last she unreservedly gave her consent and made arrangements to perform the **स्वस्त्ययन** ceremony for the welfare of Rāma (II. 24. 32-39).

Performed the स्वस्त्ययन ceremony, offered the choicest blessings and prayed to various gods and deities to protect her child from all dangers during his sojourn (II. 25. 1-44). मनस्विनी (II. 25. 1). यशस्विनी आयतलोचना (II. 25. 26). परमाङ्गना (II. 25. 28). भामिनी (II. 25. 37). वृद्धा, सन्तापकर्शिता (II. 26. 31). Had been granted a thousand villages for the maintenance of her dependents (II. 31. 22). मनस्विनी (II. 31. 23). Surrounded by Brāhmaṇa Brahmacāriṇs who wanted to settle down as married men. Rāma made ample provision for these beggars on the eve of his exile (II. 32. 21-22). Summoned by the king she went surrounded by her co-wives to Daśaratha's chamber to bid farewell to Rāma (II. 34. 13). यशस्विनी, वृद्धा, अक्षुद्रशीला (II. 38. 13). Having affectionately embraced Sītā reminded her of the duty she owed to her husband (II. 39. 19-25). At the words of Sītā (II. 39. 26-31) cast tears of joy mixed with pain (II. 39. 32). Saluted by Sītā, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (II. 40. 2-3). Spoken ill of by the citizens (II. 40. 23). Followed Rāma's car on foot, weeping bitterly like a mad woman (II. 40. 39-45). Caught hold of the right hand of the unconscious king and led him to the palace (II. 42. 4,10). Her company sought for by the king who paid a visit to her (II. 42. 29). Nursed the king lamenting (II. 42. 35). Lamented bitterly in the presence of Daśaratha, over the exile of her only son (II. 43. 1-21). The words of consolation uttered by Sumitrā (II. 44. 1-30) assuaged her grief (II. 44. 31). प्रमदोत्तमा (II. 44. 1). अनिन्दिता कल्याणी (II. 44. 22). अनघा (II. 44. 25). Remembered by Rāma (II. 46. 6). Remembered by Lakṣmaṇa (II. 51. 14-15; 18). वीरसूः (II. 51. 15). Rāma sent a message to her through Sumantra (II. 52. 31). Her sad plight pitied by Rāma who wept over her miserable fate (II. 53. 15; 18-24). अल्पभाग्या (II. 53. 24). The queens of Daśaratha wondered that she was alive though separated from her son (II. 57.22). Nursed Daśaratha when he swooned on hearing Rama's parting words (II. 57. 28), and requested him to speak freely to Sumantra (II. 57. 29-31). Fainted (II. 57. 32). Rama's parting message repeated to her by Sumantra (II. 58. 17-19). Daśaratha's lamentations struck terror into her heart (II.59.33). Trembling miserably seemed to fall on the ground and then requested Sumantra to drive her to Rāma (II. 60. 1-3). Consoled by Sumantra (II. 60. 5-22). His words of consolation bore no fruit (II. 60. 23). Reproached Daśaratha for having exiled two sons and Sītā, who had been brought up in the midst of plenty and comfort ; expressed her concern about Sītā ; doubted if Rāma would accept the throne once occupied by Bharata ; last of all she lamented for having been deserted both by her husband and by her only son (II. 6I. 2-26). Then realising that she had certainly insulted Daśaratha, hastened to apologise to him by touching his feet saying that it was grief alone which led her to rave against him (II. 62. 11-18). **धर्मपरा नित्यम्** (II. 62. 9). **वत्सला परेषु अपि अनृंशंसा** (II. 62. 7). **असितापांगी** (II. 63. 3). Daśaratha died in her presence (II. 64. 77). Next morning was not up in time but lay there discolored and divested of lustre (II. 65. 16-17). Roused from sleep by the noise of weeping ; fainted with the cry, "oh ! My Lord !" (II. 65. 21-23). Wept bitterly beating the breast (II. 65. 29). With tears in her eyes placed the head of the dead king on her lap and took to task Kaikeyī and expressed her determination to follow her husband to the funeral pyre (II. 66. 2-12). Removed by courtiers (II. 66. 13). Her welfare enquired after by Bharata. **आर्या धर्मनिरता धर्मज्ञा धर्मवादिनी** (II. 70. 8). Bharata afraid of her life on account of her grief (II. 73. 8). Treated Kaikeyī as her own sister. **दीर्घदर्शिनी** (II. 73. 10). **धर्मसंयुक्ता** (II, 74. 12). **एकपुत्रा**

साध्वी (II. 74. 29). Bharata tried to impress Kaikeyī with the amount of injury done by her to Kausalyā whose only son she had sent into exile (II. 74. 12-29). Hearing Bharata's voice expressed her desire to see him (II. 75. 5-6). Saying so she proceeded that way trembling (II. 75 7). विवर्णवदना कृशा (II. 75. 7). Embraced by Bharata and Śatrughna (II. 75. 9). In her extreme grief invited Bharata to ascend the throne uninterrupted now that Rāma had been exiled (II. 75. 10—16). In answer to Bharata's swearings (II. 75. 19—59) said that he should not add to her grief that way; praised his dutifulness (II. 75. 60—62). So saying she wept bitterly embracing Bharata (II. 75. 63). Went round the funeral pyre of Daśaratha (II. 76. 20). सानुक्रोशा वदान्या धर्मज्ञा यशस्विनी (II.78.15). Accompanied Bharata to bring back Rāma (II. 83. 6). Nursed Bharata when he fell into a swoon. उपवासकृशा दीना भर्तृव्यसनकर्शिता (II. 87. 6). Placed him on her lap and embraced him (II. 87. 7). तपस्विनी (II. 87. 8). Enquired in a choked voice if he kept well and if he had a piece of bad news concerning Rāma to deliver, then told him how he was the only supporter of her life (II. 87. 8—11). Consoled by Bharata (II. 87. 12). The straw bed on which Rāma lay pointed out to her by Bharata (II. 88. 2). Boarded the boat supplied by Guha (II. 89. 13). Before leaving Bharadvāja's hermitage saluted the Ṛṣi, leaning on the arm of Sumitrā (II. 92. 15—16). कृशा दीना (II.92.15). Introduced by Bharata to Bharadvāja (II. 92. 20—22). Entered a carriage joyfully in the hope of seeing Rāma (II. 92. 36). Rāma made enquiries about her of Bharata (II. 100. 10). Led by Vasiṣṭha went to see Rāma (II.104.1). Seeing the lonely ghāt frequented by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa for fetching the water of the Mandākinī, addressing Sumitrā, Kausalyā guessed that that was the path trodden by

Lakşmaņa while rendering menial services to his loving elder brother and opined that such mean duties were quite unbecoming of him (II. 104. 2—7). Then seeing the balls of इंगुदी fruits offered as पिण्डs by Rāma on a bed of kuśa grass, she exclaimed that it had been truly said that 'a person's own food becomes the food of his gods' and regretted that an emperor should have been constrained to live on such miserable dishes as those (II. 104. 8—15). Seeing Rāma broke into profuse tears (II. 104. 16—17). Rāma having bowed down to her, she affectionately removed the dust from his back (II. 104. 18—19). Similarly did she treat Lakṣmaṇa (II. 104. 20—21). Having embraced Sītā began to lament bitterly that she should have been reduced to such circumstances (II. 104. 23—26). Overpowered with grief could not speak to Rāma. Saluted by him before her departure (II. 112. 31).

Remembered by Rāma while mourning the loss of Sītā (IV. 1. 112). Drove in a car to receive Rāma on his return (VI. 127. 15). Dressed and decorated the Vānara ladies (VI. 128. 18). Took an active part in Śatrughna's coronation (VII. 63. 16—17). Expired (VII. 99. 14).

KAUSTUBHA—मणिरत्नम् Came up in the course of churning the ocean (I. 45. 39).

KAUŚĀMBĪ—a town founded by Kuśāmba—a son of Kuśa (I. 32. 6).

KRATU—a Prajāpati who came after Marīci (III. 14. 8). महाबलः came to the hermitage of Budha while he was consulting his friends with regard to Ila (VII. 90. 9).

KRATHANA—Joined the expeditionary force against Lankā with his 60 lakhs of Vānaras (VI. 26. 42-43). शक्रस्येव पराक्रमः Produced by Agni on a Gandharva girl to help the Devas against the Asuras. Lived on the same hill where Kuvera lived. श्रीमान् बलवान् युद्धेषु अकत्थनः (VI. 27. 20-23).

KRODHAVAŚĀ—Daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III. 14. 10-12). Did not mind the proffered boon of her husband (III. 14. 14). Gave birth to ten daughters—Mṛgī, Mṛga-mandā, Harī, Bhadra-madā, Mātaṅgī, Śārdūlī, Śvetā, Surabhī, Surasā and Kadrukā (III. 14. 21-22).

KRAUÑCA, The (i)—A forest situated at the distance of 3 Krośas to the south of Janasthāna (III. 69.4-5). नानामेघघनप्रख्यः प्रहृष्टरिव सर्वतः, नानावर्णैः शुभैर्मृगपक्षिगणैर्युतः (III. 69. 6) Visited by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in quest of Sītā (III. 69. 7-8). The accursed Yadu retired there (VII. 59. 20).

KRAUÑCA, The (ii)—A range of hills across the Kailāsa, the caves of which were peopled by the God-like sages. Sugrīva requested Śatabala and other Vānaras to ransack its sides and valleys carefully in search of Sītā (IV. 43. 25-27). Crossed by the birds through the hole made by Kārtikeya (VI. 12. 33).

KRAUÑCĪ—A daughter of Tāmrā and Kaśyapa; mother of the owls (III. 14. 18).

KṢIRODA SEA, THE—Churned by the Devas and the Daityas for the sake of the nectar (I. 45. 17). Innumerable Vānaras came thence (IV. 37. 25). पाण्डुरमेघाभः मुक्ताहार इवोर्मिः, Sugrīva asked Vinatā to go there in search of Sītā (IV. 40. 43-44). Visited by Sugrīva during his flight from Vālin's wrath (IV. 46. 15) Constantly fed with milk that flowed from the udders of Surabhī (VII. 23. 21).

KHARA—A Rākṣasa of Janasthāna killed by Rāma (I. 1. 47). His death foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 20). Brother of Śūrpanakhā, रणे प्रख्यातवीर्यः (III. 17. 22). Heard from Śūrpanakhā the advent of Rāma etc. in Janasthāna and the circumstances leading to her disfigurement. उग्रतेजाः (III. 18. 25—26). Flaring up in anger he enquired of Śūrpanakhā who had disfigured her in that awy and promised to avenge her wrongs (III. 19. 1—12). Sent for 14 Rākṣasas to bring the dead bodies of the three human beings whose blood S'ūrpanakhā wanted to drink (III. 19. 21—26). Finding Śūrpanakhā lamenting bitterly (III. 20. 23—25) angrily enquired of the reason and consoled her (III. 21. 1—5). Roused to action by Śūrpanakhā (III. 21. 6—21). Being admonished by Śūrpanakhā promised to kill Rāma and his brother and to supply her with their reeking blood (III. 22. 1—5). शूरः (III. 22. 1). रक्षसांवरः (III. 22. 6). Spurred on by the words of praise uttered by Śūrpanakhā asked his general Dūṣaṇa to assemble his mighty army of 14,000 Rākṣasas and to get ready his car (III. 22. 7—11). When ready took his seat on the car and ordered his army to march on (III. 22. 15—16). For some time the car moved on in the rear of his army (III. 22. 21). At his desire the charioteer gave reins to the horses (III. 22. 22—24). Reading the various evil signs in nature his heart quailed, but he shook off the feeling and in order to encourage his men indulged in bravadoes (III. 23. 16—25). Found Rāma ready to give battle (III. 25. 1). Led the attack himself surrounded by his mighty army (III. 25. 2—6). When Dūṣaṇa with his followers was killed, being angry ordered his generals to attack Rāma with various weapons (III. 26. 23—25). So saying drove towards Rāma, followed by his generals (III. 26. 26—28). Himself and Triśirā were the only ones left alive of the 14000. महारथः (III. 26. 35–37). Advanced to fight alone with Rāma (III. 26. 38). Requested by Triśirā to give him a chance to die or to win, gave him permission (III. 27. 6). On his death re-assembled the men and led the attack himself (III. 27. 20). His heart quailed on seeing Rāma's valour (III. 28. 1—3). Attacked Rāma with various weapons and displayed his skill in many ways (III. 28. 4—5). Covered the void with a cloud of arrows (III. 28. 8—9). Struck Rāma with नालीक, विकर्णि etc. (III. 28. 10). Appeared furious like Yama holding the पाश (III. 28. 11). Finding Rāma fatigued (III. 28. 12) cut off his bow (III. 28. 14—15) and shot at his heart (III. 28. 16) and shouted for joy (III. 28. 17). Cut off his coat of mail (III. 28. 18). His flag-staff cut off (III. 28. 22). Discharged four arrows at his heart (III. 28. 24). Wounded by Rāma with six arrows (III. 28. 26—27). His horses, charioteer as well as the car cut off (III. 28. 28—31). Stood on the ground with his club (III. 28 32). In reply to Rāma's words of admonishment (III. 29. 2—14) defied him and challenged him to fight to death before the sun set (III. 29. 15—24). So saying flung his club at him (III. 29. 25). Defied Rāma when scolded for his misdeeds and flung at him a huge Sāl tree. महाबलः (III. 30. 13—18). Overwhelmed by a shower of arrows from Rāma he bled profusely (III. 30. 20—21). Made a dash at Rāma (III. 30. 22). Killed by Rāma with an arrow given him by Indra, which pierced his heart (III. 30. 24-28). Appointed to rule over the Daṇḍaka regions with the help of 14000 Rākṣasas, by Rāvaṇa (VII. 24. 36—42).

GAṄGĀ, The—on which Śṛṅgaverapura was situated (I. 1. 29). Not far from which flowed the Tamasā (I. 2. 3). The crossing of which by Rāma was fore-seen by Valmīki (I. 3. 15). At the confluence of—and the Sarayū stood the hermitages of Ṛṣis. त्रिपथगा नदी (I. 23. 5—6). Here formerly did Mahādeva practise austerities (I. 23. 10). Here was Kandarpa reduced to ashes when he tried to disturb the mind of the Great God (I. 23. 10—14). Visvāmitra along with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa crossed it on a boat (I. 24. 4). Saluted by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (I. 24. 11). Lay north of Viśvāmitra's hermitage—Siddhāśrama (I. 31. 15).

सरितांश्रेष्ठा मुनिसेविता पुण्यसलिला हंससारससेविता जाह्नवी (I.35.6—7). Viśvāmitra broke his journey on its bank, bathed, made offerings of water to the manes, tended fire and ate the nectar-like **हविस्**, then sat down (I. 35. 8—10). Being asked by Rāma, Visvāmitra narrated the origin and growth of the river (I. 35. 10—12). Eldest daughter of Himavān and Menā. **रूपेणाप्रतिमा भुवि** (I. 35. 13—14). In order to fulfil their object, the Gods begged her of the Himavān. **त्रिपथगा नदी** (I. 35. 16). Himavān too gave her away with the object of doing good to the three worlds. **लोकपावनी स्वच्छन्दपथगा** (I. 35. 17). Having accepted the gift they went away with her (I. 35. 18). **सर्वलोकनमस्कृता** (I. 35. 21). **विपापा जलवाहिनी** (I. 35. 22). **सरिदुत्तमा** (I. 36. 3). Referred to by Brahman as the one who would give birth to the commander-in-chief of the Gods (I. 37. 7—8). Advised by Agni to bear the child to please the Gods (I. 37. 12). Hearing these words of Agni, assumed the divine form, when Agni deposited the semen in her entrails (I. 37. 13—14). Pleaded inability to bear the faetus any longer (I. 37. 15). Thereupon under instructions from Agni dis-gorged the faetus from out of her entrails by the side of Himavān (I. 37. 17—18). Garuḷa advised Aṁśumān to offer the Gaṅgā water to his uncles as they would go to the heaven thereby (I. 41. 19—20). Sagara could not arrive at a conclusion as to how to bring down Gaṅgā (I. 41. 25). Bhagīratha practised austerities with the intention of bringing her down (I. 42. 12). Prayed to Brahman to grant him the boon that the ashes of Sagara's sons might be washed by the waters of—(I. 42. 18—19). **हैमवती** (I.42. 23). No one other than Hara capable of breaking her fall down on the earth (I. 42. 24). Asked by Brahman to help him in this respect (I. 42. 25). As soon as Śiva consented to break her fall on his head, the great Haimavatî assuming a gigantic form fell with grea force on the head of Śiva from heaven (I. 43. 3—5) परमदुर्धरा ; with the intention of carrying Śiva into the under-world along with her (1. 43. 6). Reading her mind Śiva confined her in the labyrinth of his matted hair for a number of years (1. 43. 7—9). At the intercession of Bhagîratha released her into the Lake Vindu (I. 43. 10—11). Thence branched off into seven streams : viz. Hrādinî, Pāvanî, Nalinî to the east ; शिवजला शुभा (I. 43. 12) ; as Sucakṣu, Sîtā and Sindhu towards the west (1. 43. 13). The seventh followed Bhagîratha seated in a divine car (I. 43. 14). The falling waters from the head of Śaṅkara rushed forward with a tremendous noise (1. 43. 15). The world enriched by fishes, tortoises and porpoises (I. 43 16). The descent of the Gaṅgā from heaven watched by the Devarṣis, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Siddhas and the Devas seated in cars and riding on horses and elephants with an unquiet mind (1. 43. 17—19). The motion of the river was sometimes rapid, sometimes slow, sometimes high and at times low ; then sometimes a clash of waters would raise a part high up only to fall down again (1. 43. 23—25). The water which fell on the body of Hara was considered holy by the Rṣis, Gandharvas etc. (1. 43. 26). The accursed beings who had fallen from heaven went again to heaven after taking a dip in the waters (1. 43. 27—28). The people were freed from sin and were pleased as soon as they bathed in the river (1. 43. 29—30). Bhagîratha showed the way, followed hard by the Gaṅga, next came the Devas, Ṛṣis, Daityas, Dānavas, Rākṣasas, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Kinnaras, Nāgas, Serpents and Apsarās who again were followed by the aquatic animals (I. 43. 31—33). Flooded the sacrificial area of Jahnu, who being angry drank off the waters (1. 43. 34—35). When the Devas, Gandharvas, and Ṛṣis propitiated him by acknowledging Gaṅgā to be his daughter, he released her by the way of the ears. Hence Gaṅgā is called Jāhnavî as well (1. 43. 38). Resuming the journey she reached the pit dug by Sagara's sons (सागरः) (1. 43. 39). Thence she went to the nether world (1. 43. 40) and washed away the piles of ashes to which the Sons of Sagara were reduced (1. 43 41). यशस्विनी (1. 43. 33). सरितां श्रेष्ठा सर्वपापप्रणाशिनी (1. 43. 34). जह्नुसुता ; जाह्नवी (1. 43. 38). सरित्प्रवरा (1. 43. 39). Brahman appeared before Bhagîratha as soon as the water of the Gaṇgā had washed away the ashes (1. 44. 2). Called her the eldest daughter of Bhagîratha and named her after him. भागीरथी (1. 44. 5). Called also त्रिपथगा for traversing the three regions (1. 44.6). Crossed by Rāma, Viśvāmitra etc. (1. 45. 8). Described (II. 50. 12—26). शीघ्रगा सागरसंगमा (II. 52. 3). Saluted by Sîtā and Lakṣmana (II. 52 79). सुभगा, सर्वकामसमृद्धिनी (II. 52. 85). अनघा (II. 52. 91). Crossed by the exiled Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sîtā near Śṛṅgaverapura (II. 52. 92). महानदी (II. 52. 101). Rāma etc. proceeded towards the country where she met the Yamunā (II. 54. 2). Rāma guessed from the noise produced by the mingling of the waters of the two rivers that they had arrived at their confluence (II. 54. 6.) On the confluence was situated the hermitage of Bharadvāja Ṛṣi (II. 54. 8). रमणीयश्च पुण्यश्च समागमः (II. 54. 22). Vasiṣtha's messengers crossed the river at Hāstinapura (II. 68. 13). Bharata's arrival at its confluence with the Sarasvatī on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 5). Bharata crossed it at Prāgvaṭa (II. 71. 10). The high road built by Bharata ran up to banks of Gaṅgā (II.80.21). Bharata on his way to Citra-Kūṭa broke his journey on her bank (II. 83. 26). Crossed the river with the help of Guha (II. 89. 21). Crossed by Bharata on his way back from Citra-Kūṭa (II.113.21—22). Sugrîva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sîtā (IV.40.20). Accompanied Sāgara when he appeared before Rāma (VI. 22. 22). Rama's car passed accross—(VI.123.51). Flowed through the fifth atmospheric region (VII. 23 (d). 8). Called the आकाश-गंगा when flowing through the eighth atmospheric region (VII. 23 (d). 13—14). On their way to the hermitage crossed by Sîtā and Lakṣmaṇa (VII. 46. 33).

GAJA—Partook in the coronation ceremony of Sugrîva (IV.26.35). Lakṣmaṇa passed by his richly furnished house at Kiṣkindhā (IV.33.9). बलवान् वीरः Supplied Sugrīva with 3 krors of Vānaras (IV. 39. 26). Sugrîva wanted to send him to the south in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 3). Having ransacked the Vindhyas, entered the Ṛkṣa cave in search of water (IV. 50. 1-8). In response to Aṅgada's appeal told that he could jump 10 Yojanas (IV. 65. 3). Placed in charge of a wing of the expeditionary force by Rāma (VI. 4. 33). Fought at the southern gate under Aṅgada (VI. 41. 39-40). Ran about here and there defending the army (VI. 42. 31). Fought a duel with Tapana. महाबल: (VI. 43. 9). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI. 47. 2-4). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 44). Created by the Gods to help Rāma (VI. 36. 48).

GANDHARVAS, The—Assembled at the Putreṣṭi sacrifice of Daśaratha (I. 15. 4). Complained against the acts of high-handedness of Rāvaṇa to Brahman (I. 15. 6—11). Rāvaṇa was granted a boon by Brahman that he was not to be killed by a—(I. 15. 13). Oppressed by Rāvaṇa (I. 15. 22). Destroyed by Rāvaṇa while disporting in the groves of the Nandana (I. 15. 23). Took refuge with Viṣṇu (I. 15. 25). Praised him (I. 15. 32). The Devas requested by Brahman to produce Vānara children on—girls (I. 17. 5). Sang merrily on the birth of Rāma etc. (I. 18. 17). Failed to bend the bow of Janaka (I. 31. 9). Approached Brahman to complain against Sagara's sons (I. 39. 23-26). Watched the descent of the Gaṅgā (I. 43. 17). Touched the holy water (I. 43. 25). Followed the course of the Gaṅgā (I. 43. 32). Pleased at the expiation of Ahalyā's sin (I. 49. 19). Lived in the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha (I. 51. 23). Panic-stricken when Visvāmitra got ready to discharge the Brāhma weapon on Vaśiṣṭha (I. 56. 15). Approached Brahman and requested him to grant Viśvāmitra's wishes (I. 65. 9-18). Sang on the occasion of Rāma's marriage (I. 73. 38). Assembled to witness the duel between Rāma and Paraśu Rāma (I. 76. 10). Called on by Kaikeyī to witness the oath taken by Daśaratha (II. 11. 14-16). Their help sought for by Bharadvāja in the matter of entertaining the army of Bharata (II. 91. 16). Sang in the hermitage of Bharadvāja (II. 91. 26). Retired after taking leave of the Ṛṣi next morning (II. 91. 82). Resided in the hermitage of Agastya (III. 11. 89). Prayed for the success of Rāma in his fight against Khara (III. 23. 27-29). Came to witness the wonderful struggle (III. 24. 19-23). Grieved to find Rāma wounded when the army of Khara delivered its first attack (III. 25. 15-16). Could not defeat Rāvaṇa in battle (III. 32. 6). Rāvaṇa was not to meet his death at their hands (III. 32. 18-19). Rāvaṇa came across groves peopled by—(III. 35. 14; 20). Lived in the Janasthāna (III. 67. 6). 24 Krors lived on the Pāri-yātra hills in the Western Seas. तपस्विनः अग्निसंकाशाः घोराः पापकर्मणः पावकार्चिप्रतीकाशाः (IV.42.20-21). दुरासदाः वीराः सत्त्ववन्तः महाबलाः भीमविक्रमाः (IV. 42. 23). Haunted the Somāśrama (IV. 43. 14). Dwelt in the Uttara Kurus (IV. 43. 49) पानसंसर्गकर्कशाः Left the Mahendra hills before Hanumān leapt across the sea (IV. 67. 45). देवकल्पाः Haunted the Mahendra Hills (V. 1. 6). Showered flowers on Hanumān while he was crossing the sea (V. 1. 81.). Requested Surasā to put obstruction in Hanūmān's way so as to try his valour and skill (V. 1. 137-140). Haunted the aerial regions (V.1. 167). Were pleased with the achievements of Hanūmān in Laṅkā (V.54. 46). Were surprised to find Laṅkā destroyed by Hanumān (V. 54. 50.) Haunted the Ariṣṭa hills (V.56. 36). Left them when they sank under the weight of Hanumān (V.56. 48). Compared to blooming lotuses in the sky-sea (V.57. 1). Hastened to see the bridge when ready (VI. 22. 71.) Went into raptures when Rāma killed Kumbhakarṇa (VI. 67. 172). Assembled to witness the struggle between Makarākṣa and Rāma (VI. 79. 25). Prayed for the welfare of the universe while Indrajit fought with Lakṣmaṇa (VI. 89. 38). Protected Lakṣmaṇa while he was fighting with Indrajit (VI. 90. 63). Went into raptures when Indrajit was killed (VI. 90. 75). Danced with joy (VI. 90. 85). Sighed a sigh of relief (VI. 90. 88). Praised the valour of Rāma (VI. 93. 35). Grumbled when Rāvaṇa comfortably seated in a chairot fought with Rāma on foot (VI. 102. 5). Became deeply concerned when Rāvaṇa overpowered Rāma (VI. 102. 30). Came to witness the the final combat between Rāma and Rāvaṇa (VI. 102. 43 ; (VI. 106. 19). Prayed for the safety of the cows and Brāhmaṇas when Rāma fought with Rāvaṇa (VI. 107. 48-49). Witnessed the final struggle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa (VI. 107. 51). Returned home engaged in pleasant conversations (VI. 112. 1-4). Saw Sītā entering the fire (VI. 116. 31 ; 33). Sang on the occasion of Rāma's coronation (VI. 128. 71). Praised Viṣṇu when he went out to fight against Mālyavān etc. (VII. 6. 68). Frequented the banks of the Mandākinī (VII. 11 42) Witnessed the fight between Yakṣas and the Rākṣasas (VII. 15. 6). Came to witness the struggle between Yama and Rāvaṇa (VII. 22. 17). Played on various musical instruments when Indra went out to fight

Rāvaṇa (VII. 28. 26). Visited the Vindhyas along with their women folk (VII.31.16). Approached Brahman when Vāyu withheld from blowing (VII. 35. 53). Accompanied Brahman to propitiate Vāyu (VII. 35. 64). Pitied Vāyu on finding him engaged in nursing his wounded child (VII. 35. 65). Heard the story as related by Nārada (VII. 37 (d). 6). Greatly disconcerted at the discomfiture of Śatrughna (VII. 69.13). When Śatrughna drew out the divine arrow to kill Lavaṇa (VII. 69. 16—19), losing the balance of mind, approached Brahman (VII.69.20—21). Honored Rajatla for fear of incurring his displeasure (VII. 87. 5—6). 30 Krors ruled over the land watered by the Sindhu (VII. 100. 11—12). Fought with Bharata and Yudhajit to defend their country (VII. 101. 4—6). Destroyed to a man and their land annexed (VII. 101. 7—9). Having learnt the intention of Rāma to retire from the world, their young ones came to his court (VII. 108. 19). Crowded on the bank of the Sarayū (VII. 110. 7). Expressed their joy on the return of Viṣṇu (VII. 110. 14).

GANDHARVI—A daughter of Surabhî (III. 14. 27). Mother of horses (III. 14. 28).

GANDHAMĀDANA—The Vānara son of Kuverā श्रीमान् (I. 17. 12). Partook in the coronation ceremony of Sugrîva (IV. 26. 35). In response to Sugrîva's call joined him with Krors of Vanaras (IV. 39. 29). Sugriva intended to send him to the south in search of Sîtā (IV. 41. 4). Approved of Aṅgada's proposal to ransack the southern regions once more in search of Sîtā (IV. 49. 11—14). Searched once more the Vindhyan forests and the Rajata Hills till exahusted (IV. 49. 15—20). Entered the Ṛkṣa cave in search of water (IV. 50. 1 - 8). महातेजा in reply to Aṅgada's appeal said that he could leap across 50 yojanas (IV. 65. 6). गन्धहस्तीव दुर्धर्षः तरस्वी. Placed in charge of the left wing of the expeditionary force by Rāma (VI. 4. 17). Placed in charge of the left flank of the army (VI. 24. 16). Ran about here and there protecting the army (VI. 42. 31). Attacked Kumbhakarṇa but was wounded (VI. 67.24—28). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 43). Killed the draught horses of Indrajit and demolished his chariot (VI. 89. 48—51). Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 20).

GAYA—A powerful king who admitted the supremacy of Rāvaṇa (VII. 19. 5).

GAYĀ—Gaya, the king of the country, named it after him, founded the town that sons might relieve their ancestors from the पुत् hell by paying a visit to it (II. 107. 11—13).

GARULA—The sacrificial pit of Daśaratha was triangular in form like the Garula of golden wings (I. 14. 29). Viṣṇu appeared riding on वैनतेय (I. 15. 1)7. Brother of Sumati, the younger queen of Sagara (I. 38. 4). Seen in the nether world by Amśumān. खगाधिपः ; maternal uncle of his uncles. अनिलोपमः (I. 41. 16). महाबलः, Advised him to offer the water of the Gangā in memory of his ancestors (I. 41. 17. 21). सुपर्ण : His stealing of the अमृत from the heaven referred to (II. 25. 33). His temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12. 20). Son of Vinatā (III 14. 32). Perched on the far-spreading branch of the banyan tree, with the contesting elephant and tortoise. The branch giving way under his weight, ate up both creatures out of pity for tho sages who were practising austerities down below (III. 35, 27-33). पतगोत्तमः (III. 35. 29). धर्मात्मा (III. 35. 32). Being thus encouraged executed his plan of stealing nectar from the well-protected mansion of Indra III. 35. 34-35). His house stood under a big Śālmalī tree in the Lohita sea and was built by Viśva-karman (IV. 40 39-40). Sampāti traced his origin to him (IV. 58. 27), Son of Arișṭa-Nemin. **महाबलः गरुत्मानिव विख्यातः सर्वपक्षिणाम् उत्तमः** (IV. 66. 4). Seen by Jāmbavān many times, picking up huge snakes from the sea (IV. 66. 5). One of the three eings who could cross the sea (V. 56. 9). Relieved Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa of the coils of the **नागपाश** applied by Indraijt and then cured the wounds on their body (VI. 50. 36-59). **रूपसम्पन्नः दिव्यस्रगुपलेपनः विरजे वस्त्रे वसानः दिव्याभरणभूषितः** (VI. 50. 44). In reply to Rāma's enquiries (VI. 50. 41-44) introduced himself as his intimate friend and explained to him the difficulty of the situation he had been in, enumerated his services to him, advised him to fight considerately with the Rākṣasas and then embracing him took his departure (VI. 50. 45-60). Went into raptures when Rāma killed Kumbhakarṇa (VI. 67. 172). Protected Lakṣmaṇa when he fought with Indrajit (VI. 90. 63). Came to witness the final combat between Rāma and Rāvaṇa (VI. 102. 43). Carried Viṣṇu on his back when he fought with Mālyavān etc (VII. 6. 66). Wounded by Mālin on the forehead with a club (VII 7. 38), he took to fight (VII. 7. 39). When the Rakṣasas took to flight pursued and killed many of them VII. 7. 46-48). Mālyavān having wounded Viṣṇu, attacked him, but he put him to flight moving the wings furiously (VII. 8. 17-18). A denizen of the sixth atmosphere region (VII. 23(d) 10-11). Hanūmān swifter than—(VII. 35. 26). Came to witness the oath—taking ceremony of Sītā in Rāma's court (VII. 37. 8). Expressed joy on the return of Viṣṇu (VII. 110. 14).

GARGA—Witnessed the oath-taking ceremony of Sītā in Rama's court (VII. 96. 4).

IV—STUDIES IN HINDU LAW

Evidence

By Gangānātha Jhā

Reference.

Manu—Text and commentary—translated by Gaṅgānātha Jhā (Calcutta University)

Yājñavalkya with Mitākṣarā (Ed : Setlur)

„ —Aparārka (Anandāshrama S-S.)

„ —Vishvarūpa (Trivandrum S-S.)

Mayūkha—(Ed : P. V. Kane)

Vîramitrodaya—Vyavahāra—(Ed : Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1875)

Parāsharamādhava (Biblio Indica)

Nārada	Sacred Books of the East.
Bṛhaspati	
Āpastamba-Gautama	
Vashiṣṭha	
Baudhāyana	
Viṣṇu.	

It has been explained above that Evidence is of four kinds—(1) Documentary, (2) Oral, (3) Possession and (4) Ordeals.

We shall now deal with each of these four in detail.

(*A*) *Documents.*

1. Document is of two kinds—(a) written by oneself, (b) written by another.—(Nārada, 4. 135)

Document is of two kinds—(a) written by the common people, (b) written by the King.—(Vashiṣṭha, app. 10)

Document is of three kinds—(a) written by the King, (b) written in public, by a public scribe, (c) written by the party himself.—(Bṛhaspati, 8-3).

Document is of three kinds—(a) Attested by the King, (b) attested by witnesses, (c) unattested.—(Viṣṇu, 7-1-3).

NOTES.

The first division of Document is into—(A) Written by the King, Royal Edict, and (B) Written by the Common People; and of the latter there are two divisions—(a) written by oneself (unattested) and (b) written by another (and attested).—(Mitākṣarā, on 2-84).

(A) DOCUMENT WRITTEN BY THE KING—ROYAL EDICT.

2. Of the Royal Edict, there are three divisions—(a) *Dānapatra*, Royal Grant, (b) *Prasāda-lekha*, mark of Royal Favour, and (c) *Jaya-patra*, Decree.—(Bṛhaspati 8).

The Royal Edict is of four kinds—(a) Grant, (b) Decree, (c) Proclamation of Commands, and (d) Request addressed to Teachers and other respectable persons.—(Vashiṣṭha, in Āparārka, p. 683; and Vîramitrodaya, Vyavahāra, p. 195).

3. Having made a gift of a tract of land or the like, the king should cause a formal grant to be executed on a copper-plate, or a piece of cloth, stating the name of the place, the king's three ancestors,—of the king's mother, of the king himself,—containing the statement 'This grant has been made to A, belonging to such and such a Vedic School',–it is to be as endurable as the Sun and the Moon; it is to descend, by right of inheritance, to the son, grandson and more remote descendants, as a gift which should never be cut down or taken away, and is to be entirely exempt from all reductions.—(Bṛhaspati 8. 12-14).

When the king has made a gift of land, or of royalties,* he should have a document written up, for the purpose of making the gift recognised by future kings†—(Yājñavalkya 3. 18).

Either on a piece of cloth, or on a copper-plate, the king shall get written a deed of gift,—mentioning thereon the names of himself and of his ancestors,‡ the exact extent of the gift, the§ boundaries of the land given away, and the Era—(Yājña. 3. 19).

To those upon whom the king has bestowed land, he must give a document, for the information of future kings—which must be written on a piece of cloth or copper-plate, and must contain the names of his ancestors, a declaration

---

[*] Entitling the donee to receive a fixed portion out of every load of merchandise imported—(*Aparārka*).

Assigning to the Donee a fixed share out of the produce of every plot of land—(Mitākṣarā).

[†] Such gifts can be made only by kings; they cannot be transferred by the Donees.

[‡] And of the Donees—Says the Mitākṣarā.

[§] Thus the Mitākṣarā; according to Aparārka 'Describing the evil effects of interfering with the gift.'

of the condition of the land, imprecations upon those who would seek to appropriate the gift.—(Viṣṇu 3. 82).

4. The grant shall be attested by the king and bear his seal.—(Yājñavalkya 3. 19).

The grant shall be sealed by the king.—(Viṣṇu 3. 82).

A document is said to be 'attested by the king' when it is written, by his order, by the Royal Scribe, and signed by the Chief Judge in his own hand.—(Viṣṇu, 7. 3).

The Grant should be written by the Minister, and sealed and signed by the king himself.—(Vashiṣṭha, in Aparārka p. 683 and Vīramitrodaya—Vyavahāra, p. 195).

The Royal Grant is genuine when supported by the royal seal, witnesses and the king's signature.—(Kātyāyana in Aparārka p. 684).

The Royal Scribe, who writes out treaties, should write the grant on copper-plate or on cloth.—(Vashiṣṭha-Vīra-Vyava. p. 193).

The King, in his own hand, shall attest the grant, saying 'This is agreed to by me, the king, the son of so and so'.

The Grant shall be attested by the Minister with the remark—'I know this'.—(Bṛhaspati 8. 16).

The grant shall be provided with the king's seal—with a precise statement of the year, month, fortnight and date. Such a document is called the "Royal Edict".—(Bṛhaspati 8. 17).

5. When the King, satisfied with the faithful services, valour and other good qualities of a person, bestows upon him landed or other property, the document conveying this gift is called '*Prasādalikhita*', Mark of Royal Favour.—(Bṛhaspati 8-18)

6. The document that establishes a claim, recording the four parts of the judicial proceedings, and bearing the Royal Seal, is called *Jayapatra*, 'Decree'.—(Bṛhaspati 8-19).

To the man who has proved his claims to a property, movable or immovable, the King shall grant the Decree, wherein shall be set forth the plaint, the rejoinder, the evidence and pleadings, its examination, the law-texts bearing upon the question, and the final decision.—(Vyāsa—in Vīra—Vyava P. 194).

7. If there is agreement among the members of the court, then alone is the Decree final and absolute.—If there is disagreement, the matter should be regarded as open to investigation.—(Nārada, 3-17).

8. Members of the Court are to append their signature to the Decree —(Manu quoted in Mitākṣarā).

9. One suit having been decided, if there are other suits similarly circumstanced, the decision arrived at in the former case becomes applicable to the latter also. This application of the former decision is a particular kind of Decree, called '*Pashchātkāra*'—(Kātyāyana-in-Vîra-Vyava, p. 195 and Parāsharamādhava-Vyava-p. 90).

---

10. Documents written by common people are written by a public scribe, in a public place, and set forth the name and genaeology of the king, the name of the year, month, fortnight and date; the caste and names of the parties and their fathers, the property involved, rates of interest and so forth.—(Vyāsa-in Parāsharamādhava-Vyava, p. 92).

11. Documents written by the Common people are of seven kinds, dealing with—(1) Partition, (2) Gift, (3) Purchase, (4) Mortgage, (5) Convention or Agreement, (6) Bondage, and (7) Debt.

There are eight varieties—(1) *Chīkara*—written by a public scribe employed by the Debtor and the Creditor, setting forth the declarations of both parties—along with the names of their fathers and their witnesses ;—(2) *Svahasta* —written by the debtor in his own hand, not attested by witnesses ;—(3) *Upagata*,—the* document, written by a scribe or by the creditor himself, and admitted by the debtor —(4) *Ādhipatra*, mortgage-deed ;—(5) *Krayapatra*—Deed of Sale;—(6) *Sthitipatra*-a document setting forth the conventions of the learned, of the Trade-guilds, and of citizens and villagers ;—(7) *Sanāhipatra*—document embodying the compromise arrived at by the interposition of the elders before whom a certain accusation has been laid,—setting forth the facts of the case ;—(8) *Shuddhipatra*—Document of Absolution, awarded to a man who, having been accused of a wrong act, has cleared himself by the performance of penance.—(Vyāsa in Parāsharamādhava—Vyava-p. 92).

Sīmāpatra is the document setting forth the delimitation of disputed boundaries, as recorded by the King, after due investigation, mentioning the names of witnesses through whom the decision has been arrived at.—(Viṣṇu 8. 255).

12. When a certain understanding has been arrived at by the parties voluntarily, a deed should be drawn up, attested by witnesses—the name of the creditor being entered first ; †—it shall mention the month, fortnight, and date,—the name, caste, *gotra*, Vedic School, father's name of the parties. ‡—(Yājñavalkya 2. 84—85).

---

* So explained by Kātyāyana (Parāsharamādhava—Vyava. p. 92).

† Then, the name of the Debtor—says Vishvarūpa.

‡ Also the property concerned, its extent and so forth—says the Mitākṣarā.

12. Caste, names, residence, substance, amount, rate of interest, year, month, fortnight, date—these should be mentioned in the document.—(Vyāsa in Aparārka, P. 685).

13. When the transaction is complete, the debtor shall attest the document in his own hand, with the words—'What is here set forth is admitted by me A, the son of B.—(Yājña. 2–86).

14. The document shall be attested by witnesses in their own hands, who shall add their own and their father's names, adding 'I am witness to the transaction'; the number of witnesses shall be an odd one. *—(Yājña 2—87).

15. The Scribe shall write down his own and his father's name—adding that he has written the document at the request of both parties.—(Yājña. 2—88).

16. If the debtor happen to be illiterate, he should have his attestation written by another person, in the presence of literate witnesses.—(Nārada.—Aparārka P. 685).

17. If the witnesses to a transaction are illiterate, their attestation shall be written by another person, in the presence of literate witnesses.—(Do).

18. A document is valid even when not attested by witnesses, if it is written by the party himself,—except when it has been written by force or through deception. †—(Yājña.)

---

* This according to Aparārka, which accepts the reading 'asanāḥ'.—Vishvarūpa, with the same reading, fixes the number at *three* only, quoting the test '*lekhye tu paramāstrayaḥ*'.—The Mitākṣarā reads 'samāḥ', and explains it to mean that the witnesses should be *of equal status*.

† Or Temptation, anger, fear intoxication and also forth.—adds the Mitākṣarā.

19. Documents are of two kinds—written by the party himself, and written for him by another scribe: the former is valid without witnesses, the latter requires attesting witnesses—(Nārada 4. 135.)

20. A document is said to be attested by witnesses when, having been written anywhere by any one, it is attested by witnesses in their own hands. (Viṣṇu. 7. 4.)

21. A document is said to be *unattested* when it has been written by the party himself and bears the signature of no witnesses. (Viṣṇu 7. 5.)

22. If the defendant urges that the document was not written by the scribe therein mentioned, nor attested by witnesses there named, such a document is suspected of being *forged* (Kātyāyana in Aparārka p. 689)

23. If the genuineness of a document is in doubt, it should be tested by means of the following corroborative proofs: (a) by comparing the suspected writing with the writing of the party on a document admittedly in his hand—writing, —(b) *Yukti-prāpti* (Probability * of ownership),—(c) *Kriyā* (Evidence adduced in regular suit),—(d) *Chihna* (peculiarities of hand-writing or seal),—(e) *Sambandha* (previous business—relationship between the parties),–(f) *Āgama* (proof of purchase or other sources of ownership of the creditor. †)

---

* Vishvarūpa, Aparārka and Mayūkha take युक्ति and प्राप्ति separately; the former as 'such reasoning as that the debtor was in need at the time when the creditor was advancing loans,' and the latter as 'Co-residence of the parties.' 'Absence of undue force'—(Vishvarūpa).

† Vishvarūpa takes '*hetu*' separately, as standing for such reasons as 'absence of false witnesses' or 'honesty of the scribe' and so forth. Aparārka takes it as standing for 'Inference.'

24. If a doubt should exist as to the authenticity of a document, its authenticity may be established by examining the handwriting of the party, the tenor of the document, peculiar marks, circumstantial evidence and probabilities of the case. (Nārada 4.143 and Viṣṇu 7.12).

25 If a document is signed by a stranger, and is meant for a different purpose, it should be examined, if suspected of being authentic, in regard to the connection of the parties, the probability of the title and by reasonable inference (Nārada, 4.144).

26. In the case of the document alleged to be in the handwriting of the defendant,—its genuineness is to be tested by comparing it with his handwriting; if it is attested by witnesses, it is tested by examining these witnesses.—(Kātyāyana in Aparārka P. 689).

27. If the Debtor, the witnesses and the scribe are all dead,–the genuineness of the document shall be tested by comparing the writings on the document with the writing of the persons on documents admitted to be in their handwriting.—(Kātyāyana; also Viṣṇu 7.13 in Aparārka, P. 689.)

28. The genuineness of a document is to be tested by making the parties write something and comparing that writing with the alleged signatures on the document. (Kātyāyana in Vīra-Vyava, P. 198.)

29. If the debtor denies execution of the deed, the decision shall be taken on the issue of an ordeal—(Hārīta in Mitākṣarā 2. 92).

30. When a document has been seen by the debtor, and he has made no protest against it for twenty years, then the document becomes free from all defects and fully substantiated.—(Kātyāyana in Vīra—Vyava. P. 198)

31. An old document,—if it has not been shown or spoken of for a long time,—and both parties are dead,—it cannot be regarded as valid unless it is covered by a mortgage. —(Vyāsa in Aparārka P. 692).

32. A bond ceases to be valid if the witneses, the creditor and the debtor are all dead,—unless its validity can be established by the existence of a pledge .—(Nārada 4.138.)

33. If a document has not been shown, or mentioned, for thirty years—it cannot be regarded as valid, even though the attesting witnesses be living—(Bṛhaspati. 8-29).

34. If, after the ceasing of the accruing of interest, the document is not shown to the debtor, nor payment demanded of him,—the document is treated as of doubtful validity.—(Bṛhaspati, 8-30).

35. If the document has been produced in due time, —and the demand has been repeatedly urged and publicly proclaimed,—it remains valid for ever; even after the death of witnesses.—(Nārada 4-140).

36. If the debt has been paid in part,—or if demand for payment has been made,—the document should be regarded as valid, even though the attesting witnesses may be dead.—(Nārada in Aparārka, P. 689).

37. A document which is unknown and has never been heard of before, does not obtain validity, when it is brought forward; even though witnesses be living.— (Nārada 4. 141).

38. What is given by force, what is enjoyed by force, what has been written by force,—all this Manu has declared to be void.—(Manu 8. 168).

39. A document written under constraint, or under a deception, does not hold good.—(Yājña 2. 89).

40. A document becomes defective by the defectiveness of witness, and of scribe, or by the detection of some deception on the part of either party to the transaction.—

41. When even a single witness entered in the deed is disreputable and censured (by the public),—the deed is invalidated.—(Bṛhaspati 8. 24).

42. Where the scribe is found to be disreputable and censured (by the public)—the deed is invalidated.—(Bṛhaspati 8. 24).

43. A document written by the debtor in his own hand, and not attested by witnesses, cannot be accepted as valid, unless it is admitted by the party alleged to have written it.—(Kātyāyana in Aparārka, P. 686).

44. That document is valid which is not adverse to the customs of the country, the contents of which are in accordance with the rules regarding Pledge, and which is consistent in import and language.—(Nārada, 4. 136 and Viṣṇu 7. 11).

45. That document which violates local customs, which is couched in ambignous language or incoherent, or executed by a person who had no right over the property concerned,—is not valid.—(Kātyāyana in Aparārka P. 686)

46. A document spoilt by fire, or executed very long ago, or soiled with dirt, or intended for a short period only, or containing mutilated syllables, is false.—(Bṛhaspati 8-25)

47. An old document, too bright-inked—or a recent document, too dim—inked,—should be regarded as forged.—(Bṛhaspati in Parāshara mādhava—Vyava. 95).

48. An unattested document, if caused to be written by force, makes no evidence; neither does a fraudulent document; nor a document, though attested, which is

vitiated by the signature of a witness who has been bribed, or of one who is of bad character; or one written by a scribe who is of bad character, or bribed; or one executed by a minor, or by a dependent person, or by one intoxicated or insane, or by one in bodily danger, or in fear.—(Viṣṇu 7. 6-10)

49. That document is invalid which has been written by a person intoxicated, by one charged with a crime, by a woman, or by a child,—or that which has been caused to be written by force, by intimidation or by deception (Nārada, 4-137)

50. A document executed by a mad man or an idiot or an infant, or one who has absconded from fear of the King, or one tormented by fear, is not invalidated (by impossibility to produce its author).—But as a rule, a document executed by a dying person, or one oppressed with fear, or a suffering person, or a woman, or an intoxicated person, or a distressed person, or at night, or by frand or force—does not hold good.—(Bṛhaspati 8, 22-23)

51. If objections taken against the validity of a document are not answered, the man producing it is to be fined the first ammercement.—(Kātyāyana in Vīra. Vyava P. 199).

52. If a man alleges a document to be a forgery, but it is proved to be genuine, he should have his tongue, hands and feet cut off (Vyāsa in Vīra. Vyava P. 199).

53. If the original document happen to be in an inaccessible place, or is found to be written illegibly, or has been lost, or has its writing rubbed off, or damaged,* or burnt, or torn,—then another document should be executed†

---

*By insects—says Vishvarūpa.

†'Either by the King or by the parties themselveś—Vishvarūpa. This can be done only if there is an agreement between the

54. If the document is in a remote country, torn, or stolen, or illegible,—then, if it is in existence, time should be given for producing it ;—if it does not exist, then the case has to be decided on the strength of witnesses to the transaction.—(Nārada 4,142).

55. If a document is split, torn, stolen, effaced, lost, or badly written,—another document has to be executed—(Nārada 4,146).

56. The document written publicly, by the public scribe and attested by witnesses is more reliable than that written by the party himself, and not attested by witnesses ; and the Royal Edict is more reliable than the former—(Vyāsa in Aparārka 691).

57. Documentary Evidence is superior to oral evidence and ordeal.—(Kātyāyana in Aparārka P. 692)

58. Documentary evidence can be rebutted only by documentary evidence, and never by the oral deposition of even a large number of witnesses. (Ibid.)

59. Documentary evidence is rebutted by documentary evidence, and oral by the oral.—(Samvarta in Vira-Vyava P. 201)

60. A document can be annulled only by a document ; Document is superior to witnesses.—(Naradā 1-145)

61. A Document is not over-ruled either by witnesses or by ordeal.—(Bṛhaspati 8.31)

---

parties. If there is disagreement, then there should be a regular suit ; and in that case, the parties should be given time to produce the document. If the document cannot be produced, the case has to be decided on the basis of the deposition of witnesses. If no witnesses are available, recourse must be had to ordeal. *Mitākṣarā.*

62. No decision should be taken on the basis of Documents alone.—(Vyāsa in Vīra-Vyava, p. 197).

63. The validity of a document becomes diminished by neglect, if it is neither shown nor read out publicly.—(Bṛhaspati 8.31).

64. In disputes regarding immovable property,—as to sale or mortgage or partition or gift or purchase,—no claims can be established without Documentary Evidence—(Marīchi in Parāsharamādhava-Vyava—p. 93).

65. When the debtor has made a part-payment of the debt, he should enter that on the back of the deed ;—the creditor also should write down there in his oun hand.—'I have received this.'—(Yājñavalkya 2. 93).

66. When only a part of the debt has been repaid, and the document is not at hand, the creditor shall give a receipt for what he has received.—(Viṣṇu 6. 26).

67. When the entire debt has been repaid, either the document shall be torn off, or the Creditor shall give to the debtor an acquittance-receipt.*—(Yājña. 2. 94).

68. A written contract having been fulfilled, the document should be torn.—(Viṣṇu 6. 25).

69. What has been lent in the presence of witnesses should be repaid also in the presence of witnesses.—(Yājña. 2. 94).

70. A debt contracted before witnesses should be discharged before witnesses.—(Viṣṇu 6-24.)

(B) ORAL EVIDENCE : WITNESSES

1. INTRODUCTORY—In doubtful cases, when two parties are quarrelling with one another, the truth has

---

* The option lies with the Creditor—says Vishvarūpa.

to be gathered from the deposition of witnesses, whose knowledge is based upon what they have seen, heard or learnt. (a) (Quoted as 'Manu' in Parāsharamādhava Vya. p. 64 ; Nārada 1.147)

2. In disputed cases, the truth shall be established by means of witnesses.—(Gautama 13. 1)

3. A witness is so called because he has directly seen or heard.—(Manu 8. 74 and Viṣṇu).

4. What the man has actually perceived in the presence of the parties to the suit—his deposition to that alone should be admitted as evidence—(Bṛhaspati in Vīra-Vya-p. 142).

WHO CAN BE WITNESSES ?

5. Householders, men with male issue, respectable native Kṣattriyas, Vaishyas or Shūdras are competent, when called by a suitor, to give evidence.—(Manu 8. 62)

6. Trustworthy men of all the four castes may be made witnesses in law-suits,—men who are fully conversant with morality and are free from covetousness.—(Manu 8. 63).

7. Women should give evidence for women; for twice-born men, similar twice-born men; virtuous Shūdras for Shūdras men of the lowest castes for the lowest.—(Manu, 8. 68).

8. Any person who has personal knowledge of the facts in question may give evidence.—(Manu 8. 69)*

9. He should be considered as a witness who has witnessed a deed with his own eyes or ears.—(Nārada 1.148).†

---

*What is meant is 'any one who has a knowledge of facts bearing on the case, acquired by any of the valid means of cognition.'—Vira-Vya. p. 143.

†The term '*sākṣī*' takes the '*ini*' affix in the sense of 'one who sees directly'—(Pānini 5. 2. 91.)

10. Witnesses shall be of honourable family,* straightforward, and of unexceptionable descent.—(Nārada 1.153).

11. In family—quarrels, members of the family shall be witnesses—(Nārada 1.153).

12. Brāhmaṇas, Vaishyas, Kṣattriyas or irreproachable Shūdras shall be witnesses: each of these for members of the same caste;—or all of them may be witnesses for all.—(Nārada 1.154).†

13. For trade-guilds, artisans or merchants shall be witnesses; members of an association shall be witnesses for their co-members; women for women.—(Nārada 1.155).

14. Persons devoted to austerities, charitable persons, persons of noble families, truthful persons, persons having great regard for virtue, straightforward persons, persons with sons, wealthy persons, persons engaged in the performance of acts prescribed in the scriptures;—either according to *jāti* or *varṇa*, or all for all.—(Yājña. 2.68-69).

15. Women should give evidence for women, only in cases between women, or in matters concerning the female sex, which they alone may be supposed to know.—(Vashīṣṭha 16.30).‡

16. Those may be witnesses who are in the habit of performing religious duties taught in the scriptures, free from

---

* '*Maulāh*—born of well-known and respectable families—Kalpataru in Vīra. Vya p. 147.

† The Brāhmaṇa has been excluded, as it is his duty to be constantly engaged in teaching and study, which would be disturbed—Medhāt. So he should be called as a witness only when no others are available—adds Vīra-Vya p. 148.

‡ When one of the parties is a female, then alone female witnesses are admissible.—Medhā.

greed and malice, of respectable parentage, irreproachable, zealous in performing austerities, liberal-minded and sympathetic—(Bṛhaspati 7.28).

17. Witnesses shall be faultless as regards the performance of their duties, worthy to be trusted by the king, and free from love and hatred.—(Gautama 13-2).*

18. Persons not mentioned (in the plaint) may also give evidence.—(Gautama 13.8).

19. Descendants of a noble race, virtuous, wealthy, sacrificers, zealous in the practice of austerities, having male issue, well-versed in sacred law, studious, veracious, learned in the three Vedas and aged—shall be witnesses.—(Viṣṇu 8.8).

20. Shrotriyas, men of unblemished form, of good character, men who are holy and love truth, are fit to be witnesses,—or any men can bear testimony for any other † men.—Women shall be witnesses regarding women; twice-born men, regading twice-born men of the same caste; good

---

* These are to be regarded as competent witnesses only when they have been cited as such by the parties; those who come and volunteer to give evidence are not real witnesses.—(Medhātithi on Manu 8. 52.)

† *Jāti*', gender—'*Varṇā*,' caste.—(*Vishvarupa—yathājati*,) means that the witnesses should be of the same caste as the parties, in cases where both parties are of the same caste; if the parties are of different castes, then the witnesses are to be '*yathavārṇam*' i. e. in the order of the castes.—(*Aparārka*). '*Jāti*' stands for the secondary mixed castes, Ambaṣṭha' and the rest, and '*Varṇa*' for the primary castes, Brāhmaṇa and the rest. For Brāhmaṇa parties there should be Brāhmaṇa witnesses and so forth. ' Or '—i.e. if witnesses of the same caste as the parties are not available then, ' all ' may depose 'for all'.—(*Mitākṣarṇa*.)

Shūdras for Shūdras and men of low birth for low-caste men.—(Vashiṣtha 16.25-30).

21. Men of the four castes who have sons may be witnesses; excepting Shrotriyas, the king, ascetics, and those who are destitute of human intellect.—(Baudhāyana 1.19.13).

22. A person who is possessed of good qualities may be called as a witness and shall answer the questions put to him according to the truth.—(Āpastamba 2.11.29.7).

23. In the case of anything done in the interior of a house or in a forest,—or in a case of injury to the body,—any person who may have seen it with his eyes—may give evidence.—(Manu 8. 69).

24. In the event of proper witnesses not forthcoming, evidence may be given by a woman, by a minor, by an aged person, by a pupil, by a relative, by a slave, or by a servant. —The deposition of these persons is to be rejected as false only if it is found to be incoherent or bears signs of corruption.—Manu 8.70—71).*

25. In cases of violence, theft, adultery, defamation and assault, the competence of witnesses shall not be examined too strictly.—(Manu 8.72, Nārada 1.189).

26. In cases of adultery, theft, assault, defamation and crimes, all men can be admitted as witnesses.— (Yājña. 2.72).

---

*These are admissible as witnesses only when they are found to be free from such disqualifications as prejudice, wickedness and so forth. (Aparārka p. 671). Women are admissible only in cases where they can be questioned immediately, on the spot, before any one has had time to tamper with their too susceptible mind. (Medhā on 8.70.)

27. In suits of grave character, slaves and other incompetent witnesses may be admitted.—(Nārada. 1.188).

28. A slave, one who is blind, or deaf, or leprous, women, children, aged persons—these have been held to be competent witnesses in criminal cases, if they are not prejudiced—(Ushanas in Mayūkha, p. 37).

WHO CANNOT BE WITNESSES.

29. Those persons should not be made witnesses who are not trustworthy, or who neglect their duties; nor the covetous; nor those who have an interest in the suit; nor familiar friends and companions or enemies (of the parties), nor persons formerly convicted of perjury, nor persons suffering from severe illness, nor those tainted by mortal sin.—The king cannot be made a witness, nor mechanics and actors, nor a Shrotriya, nor a student of the Veda, nor an ascetic retired from the world; —nor one wholly dependent, nor one of bad fame, nor a *Dasyu*, nor one who follows forbidden occupations, nor an aged man, nor an infant, nor a single man, nor a man of the lowest castes, nor one deficient in a sense-organ,—nor one extremely grieved, nor one intoxicated, nor a lunatic, nor one tormented by hunger or thirst, nor one oppressed by fatigue, nor one tormented by derise, nor a wrathful man, nor a thief.—(Manu 8,63—67).

30. Incompetent witnesses have been declared to be of five kinds.-Excluded by a text of law, on account of depravity, on account of contradiction, on account of uncalled—for deposition and on account of intervening decease.—Learned Brāhmaṇas, devotees, aged persons and ascetics are those excluded by the text of law.—Thieves, robbers, dangerous characters, gamblers, and assassins are incompetent on account of depravity.*—If the statements of witnesses

---

*'Sāhasa' stands for *murder* here; though the name includes

summoned by the king do not agree, they are rendered incompetent by reason of contradiction.—He who, without being cited as a witness, volunteers to make a deposition, is unworthy to be a witness.—If the claimant happen to die, the witness previously cited by him is rendered incompetent by reason of decease.—(Nārada 1.157—162).

31. Those persons should not be examined as witnesses who are interested in a suit; nor friends, nor associates, nor enemies (of parties),* nor notorious criminals, nor persons tainted with a mortal sin.—Nor a slave, nor an impostor, nor one not admitted to Shrāddhas, nor a superannuated person, nor a woman, nor a child, nor an oil-pressor, nor one intoxicated, nor a lunatic, nor a gambler, nor one who sacrifices for a village-community.—Nor one engaged in a long journey, nor a merchant travelling over transmarine countries, nor an ascetic, nor one sick or deformed, nor a single person, nor a learned Brāhmaṇa, nor one who neglects religious duties, nor a eunuch, nor an actor.—Nor an atheist, nor an apostate, nor one who has forsaken his wife or his fire, nor one who makes illicit offerings, nor an adversary, nor a spy, nor a

---

theft, defamation and assault also, yet these, being mentioned by themselves, cannot be included in 'Crime' 'Sāhasa'. (*Aparārkā.*)

Theft and the rest, mentioned separately, are meant for such of these acts as are done secretly; and '*Sāhasa*' stands for all those acts when done openly, in defiance of all laws and restraints. (*Mitā*). This implication is accepted by Aparārka also.

Vishvāmitra notes that what is implied is that only eye-witnesses are admissible as evidence, in cases of theft &c.

Persons having money-dealings with either of the two parties. (Medhā).

* Friends, enemies and persons of proved dishonesty are not admissible in any case. (Medhā. Manu 8 71).

relative, nor a uterine brother.—Nor one who has been proved to be an evil-doer, nor one who lives by poison, nor a snake-catcher, nor a poisoner, nor an incendiary, nor a ploughman, nor the son of a Shūdra woman, nor one who has committed a minor offence.—Nor one oppressed by fatigue, nor a ferocious man, nor one who has relinquished all worldly desires, nor one who is penniless, nor a member of the lowest castes, nor one leading a bad life, nor a student before completion of his study, nor an oilman, nor a puller of roots;—nor one possessed by an evil spirit, nor an enemy of the king, nor a weather-prophet, nor an astrologer, nor a malicious person, nor one self-sold, nor one who has a limb too little, nor one who makes a living by his wife;—nor one who has black nails or black teeth, nor one who betrays his friends, nor a rogue, nor a wine-dealer, nor a juggler, nor an avaricious man, nor an enemy of trading companies or of guilds;—nor one who takes animal life, nor a leather-manufacturer, nor a cripple, nor an outcast, nor a stager, nor a quack, nor an apostate, nor a robber, nor a king's attendant;—nor a Brāhmaṇa who sells human beings, cattle, meat, bones, honey, milk, water or butter, nor a member of a twice-born caste addicted to usury;—nor one who neglects his duties, or the head of a caste or guild; nor one who serves low people, nor one who quarrels with his father, nor one who causes dissension.—(Nārada 1.177—187).

32. The mother's father, the father's brother, the wife's brother and maternal uncle, a brother, a friend and a son-in-law

---

If the king were to give evidence, he would be regarded as partial. Artisans and the rest are likely to suffer in business if they gave evidence for or against people. (Medhā).

*Servant engaged on fixed wages, as explained in the Nirukta; 'It does not here stand for *robber* or *thief*; it may stand for a hard-hearted person.' (Medhā).

—are inadmissible as witnesses in all disputes.—Persons addicted to adultery or to drinking, gamblers, those given to calumniating people, the insane, the suffering, the violent person and the ambitious cannot act as witnesses. (Bṛhaspati 7,7. 29—30).

33. The king cannot be made a witness, nor a learned Brāhmaṇa, nor an ascetic, nor a gambler, nor a thief, nor a person not his own master, nor a woman, nor the perpetrator of violence, nor one over-aged, nor one intoxicated or insane, nor a man of evil fame, nor an outcast, nor one tormented by hunger or thirst, nor one suffering under calamity, nor one wholly absorbed in evil passions;—nor an enemy or a friend, nor one interested in the suit, nor one who does forbidden acts, nor one formerly perjured, nor an attendant;—nor one who, without being cited, voluntarily offers himself as a witness;—nor can one man alone be made a witness:—In cases of theft, violence, abuse or assault, the character of the witnesses should not be examined too strictly.—(Viṣṇu 8.1—6).

34. Customs-officer, officer in charge of a picket, messenger, one keeping his head covered, women, students living with their Teachers, wandering mendicants, ascetics, heretics, snake-catchers, conch-collectors,—these cannot be witnesses. Women, minors, aged persons, gamblers, persons intoxicated, insane or accused of serious crime, actors, unbelievers, forgers, those deficient in organs, outcasts, a friend, one interested

---

*(1) One whose name has been entered at the instance of the creditor; (2) whose name has been entered at the instance of the debtor requested by the creditor.—(Mayukha p. 34.)—'The only difference between (1) and (2) is that while (1) writes down his own name himself, that of (2) is actually written in the document by some one else'—(Vīra-Vya- p. 145.)

in the suit, a partisan, enemies, thieves, a bravado, one proved to have perjured himself.

KINDS OF WITNESSES.

35. There are eleven kinds of witnesses: Five 'appointed' (i.e. cited by the parties) and six 'unappointed' (not cited by the parties).—(1) A subscribing witness, (2) one who has been reminded, (3) a casual witness, (4) a secret witness, (5) an indirect witness; these are 'cited' witnesses.—The six witnesses 'not cited' are—(1) co-villagers, (2) the Judge, (3) the King, (4) one acquainted with the affairs of the two parties, (5) the Agent of the claimant and (6) Family-members,—(Nārada 1.149—152).

36. (1) A 'written' witness, (2) one 'made to be written' in the body of the document, (3) a secret witness, (4) one who has been reminded, (5) a family-witness, (6) a messenger, (7) an accidental witness, (8) an indirect witness, (9) a strange witness, (10) the King, (11) the Judge, (12) co-villagers: these are the twelve kinds of witnesses.*—He is called a 'written witness' who enters in the deed his own as well as his father's caste, name and place of residence.—(2) He is called 'one made to be written' who has been distinctly entered in the deed, together with the details of the agreement, by the Plaintiff when writing the contract.—(3) He is called a 'secret witness' who is made to listen to the speeches of the debtor, standing concealed behind a wall

---

* No special significance attaches to the enumeration of those numerous qualities either here or under the preceding section;—all that is meant is that the witnesses should be such as could be relied upon to give correct evidence.—Vīra-Vya. p. 149. Persons quarrelling with their fathers are not admissible as witnesses.—(Shañkha in Mitākṣarā on 2·68:)

and relates them as heard, in court.—(4) He is called 'one reminded' who, after having been cited and invited to be present at a transaction, is repeatedly reminded of it.—(5) He is designated a 'family witness' who is cited by both parties to witness a deed of partition, gift or sale,—being related to, and on good terms with, both parties, and acquainted with the rules of duty.—(6) He is denominated a 'messenger' who is a respectable man, esteemed and cited by both parties, and has come to listen to what is transpiring between the parties.—(7) He is an 'accidental witness' who happens to approach, by chance, the place where the transaction is taking place.—(8) That witness is called 'indirect' who communicates what he knows to another man, at a time when he is going abroad, or lying on his deathbed; he also is called an 'indirect witness' who repeats, from his own hearing and from hearsay, the previous statements of actual witnesses.—(9) He is called a 'strange witness' to whom an affair has been entrusted or communicated by both parties, or who happens to witness the transaction surreptitiously.—(10) The king in person having heard the statements of the parties, may act as witness, if a dispute arises subsequently.—(11) If after the decision of a suit, a fresh trial should take place, the Judge, together with the assessors, may act as witnesses in that trial, but not in any other case.—(12) The people of the village may give testimony, even without being cited,—specially as to damages in boundaries.—(Bṛhaspati 7.1-15).

37. If a witnesse dies or goes abroad after giving evidence, those who have heard him may give evidence; as indirect evidence makes evidence. (Nārada 1.166) The 'subscribing' witness retains his validity, even after lapse of a long time; the deposition of a witness 'reminded' remains valid up to the eighth year; that of the 'casual' witness upto the fifth

year;—of the 'secret' witness, up to the third year;—of the 'indirect' witness, for one year.—(Nārada 1.167—169).

38. Or, no definite limit can be fixed for judging a witness: a witness whose understanding, memory and hearing have never been deranged, may give evidence even after the lapse of a considerable time.—(Nārada 172-171).

39. These are two kinds of witness—(1) *appointed* and (2) *not appointed*; the former is one whose name has been entered in the document, and the latter is one who is not so mentioned.—(Prajāpati in Aparārka p. 666).

40. [Like the king and the judge] Members of the Court also are admissible as witnesses. (Kātyāyana in Mayūkha p. 34).

NUMBER OF WITNESSES.

41. The number of witnesses should be at least *three*—(Yājña. 2-69).

This means that *two* also are admissible (Mitā). Even a single witness is admissible, if he is accepted by both parties and is conversant with Dharma 'a proper performer of all religious duties.'—(Mitā);—'highly qualified'—(Vishvarūpa) (Yājña. 2.72).

---

* 'By relations' (*Mitā*);—'By all cultured Men' (*Aparārka*). One abandoned, such persons cannot be witnesses. Persons meant to be included are those in whose cases there is reason to believe, either that they could not have properly seen what happened, or that they are unable to depose rightly; the list is not therefore exhaustive, it is only illustrative.—(*Vishvarūpa*). (Yājña. 2.70.71.)

One whose conduct is pure, who knows the Law, who is known to be veracious, may be admissible as witness, even alone by himself,—specially in criminal cases.—(Vyāsa in Mayūkha, p. 35 and Vīra-Vya-p. 150.

Even a single person may be a witness in the case of a deposit made secretly in his presence;— as regards things borrowed for use, even a single person through whom the thing has been sent may be enough as witness.—(Kātyāyana in Mayūkha, p. 35).

There should be nine, seven, five, four or three witnesses: or two only, if they are learned Brāhmaṇas. But the king shall never admit only one witness.—Of 'subscribing' and 'secret' witnesses, there should be two of each sort; of 'spontaneous' 'reminded', 'family' and 'indirect' witnesses, there should be three, four or five of each kind.—A single witness also may furnish valid testimony, if he is a 'messenger' or an 'accidental' witness the king or the Judge.—(Bṛhaspati 7.16—18).

Witnesses should be many in member.—(Gautma 13.2).

At least three witnesses should depose before the king.—(Manu 8. 60).

Even one man free from covetousness may be accepted as witness.—(Manu 8.77).

By the consent of both parties, even a single person may be admitted as witness; he must be examined in public as a witness.—(Nārada 1.192).

[All such texts refer to cases where both parties consent to rely upon a single witness. (Parā-Mādhava-Vya-p. 66).]

One man alone cannot be a witness—(Viṣṇu 8).

CONFLICT AMONG WITNESSES

42. On a conflict among the witnesses, the King shall accept as true the evidence of the majority ; in case of their being equal in number, that of the better qualified witnesses ; on a conflict among the highly qualified, ' preference is to be given to the higher caste'.—(Medhā) ;—'best of the twice-born' i.e. Brāhmaṇas (Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa);—'righteous Brāhmaṇas' (Kullūka and Rāghavānanda). The evidence of the best of the twice-born shall be accepted.—(Manu 8.73 ; Viṣṇu 8.39).

In cases of conflict, the evidence of the majority should be acceptod ; when the numbers are aqual on both sides, the evidence of the better qualified men shall be accepted ; when there is difference among these, then those of the best qualified amongst them.—(Yājña. 2.78).

Aparārka and Mitākṣarā both explain that this rule is not inconsistent, cannot be accepted *after judgement has been delivered* ; as the present rule admits of additional evidence only after the deposition of witnesses has been finished ;— if the judge is not quite satisfied with the evidence already adduced,—this is added by the Mitākṣarā. (Vide 7 below). Even after the deposition of all the witnesses has been taken, if other and better qualified witnesses—or witnesses double the number of the former witnesses,—should depose to the contrary, the former witnesses should be regarded as *false*.— (Yājña. 2.80).

In a dispute about a house or a field, reliance may be placed on the deposition of neighbours.—If the neighbours disagree, documents may be taken as proof.—If conflicting documents are produced, reliance may be placed on the statements of aged persons in the village or town, and on those of friends and corporations.—(Vashiṣṭha 16.13-15).

If there is conflicting evidence, the plurality of witnesses decides the matter. If the number of witnesses is equal on both sides, the testimony of those should be accepted as correct whose veracity is not liable to suspicion. If the number of such witnesses is equal on both sides, the testimony of those should be accepted who are possesed of superior memory.—When even such witnesses are equal on both sides, the evidence of the witnesses is entirely valueless. (Nārada 1,229-230).

If the witnesses disagree with one another regarding place, age, matter, quantity, shape and kind,—such testimony is worthless (Nārada 1.233).

If the statements of witnesses donot agree, they are rendered incompetent.—(Nārada 1.160).

In a conflict among witnesses, the testimony of the majority should be accepted; when the number is equal on both sides, the testimony of the more virtuous ones should be accepted: when the virtuous ones are equally divided, the testimony of those shall be accepted who are eminent for the performance of religious acts: when these latter are equally divided then the testimony of those with superior memory shall be accepted. (Bṛhaspati 7,35).

ADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE.

43. Evidence in accordance with what has been 'Heard or seen *directly*'—Medhā. Seen or heard is admissible (Manu 8.74).—When a man, not originally cited as witness, sees or hears anything and is afterwards examined regarding it, he must declare it exactly as he saw or heard it.—(Manu 5.76).

What witnesses declare 'not out of compassion, or with a view to acquiring merit,' (Medhā) ;—'not out of fear and the like' (Kullūka) ;—'without hesitation, otherwise of a witness is to be ascertained after due consideration of his *svabhāva*, character, and not from the manner of his deposition. ('Others in Medhā), Naturally, that should be admitted as evidence; depositions of other kinds are worthless. (Manu 8.78).

After the suit has been decided, the adducing of any further evidence-documentary or oral—would be futile, if it has not been cited before.—(Nārada) in Mitā or 280).

If a man relies upon weaker proof and neglects the stronger one, he is not entitled to adduce the latter, after the suit has been decided. (Kātyāyana in ditto.).

When a witness has been cited by one party, he is not to be approached in secret by the other party.—(Nārada 1-165).

WHERE NO WITNESSES ARE AVAILABLE.

44. If no witnesses are available, and the Judge is unable to ascertain the truth, recourse should be had *to** *Shapatha* (Oaths)—Manu 8.109).

When, owing to the negligence of the creditor, neither documentary nor oral evidence can be adduced,—and the other party denies the obligation, three different methods may be adopted—(a) timely reminder, (b) exhortation and argument, and (c) Oath.—(a) If on being reminded of the debt, the debtor does not repudiate it,—and this has been done three or four or five times,—then he may be compelled to pay it.—(b) If the debtor refuses the demand, he shall be exhorted with arguments relative to place, time, matter and amount, contents and so forth.—If these are of no avail, recourse should be had to Oaths (ordeals)—(Nārada 1.235-239).

WHERE WITNESSES ARE NOT NECESSARY.

45. In the following cases, no witness is necessary:

---

* 'Supernatural proof'—Medhā.

One who is caught carrying a fire-brand must be taken as the incendiary; one who is caught with a murderous weapon in his hand must be the murderer; when a man and woman are found to be embracing each other, the man must be an adulterer.—One who goes about with a hatchet in his hand should be regarded as the destroyer of bridges; one carrying an axe is taken as a fellerof trees.—In some cases, people make marks upon their body, with a view to fasten a charge of assault on an enemy;—in such cases recourse is to be had to inductive reasoning, ascertainment of facts and strategems for getting a reliable test.—(Nārada 1.172—176).

LYING PERMISSIBLE.

46. In some cases, a man who, though knowing the facts, gives false evidence from a pious motive, does not lose heaven;—whenever the death of a Shūdra, of a Vaishya, of a Kṣattriya, or of a Brāhmaṇa would be caused by a declaration of the truth, a falsehood may be spoken; in such cases falsehood is preferrable to truth.* (Manu 8. 103-104).

In a case where the death of any man of the four castes is likely to result from telling the truth, one should depose falsely. (Yājña. 2 83). (a) 'Or he may not depose at all in cases where the truth would lead to the death of one party, and untruth to that of other;—if the king insist on his deposing, the man should depose in such a manner as to render it futile one way or the other.—If even this be not possible, then he must tell the truth. If this leads to the death of any body, the witness may perform the necessary expiation.—(*Mita*).

---

* But an expiatory rite has to be performed (8. 105). Hence what is asserted here is mere *arthavāda*, not to be taken as enjoining the telling of a lie—says Prāyashchittaviveka, p. 432. What is meant is that *silence*, even *lying*, would be better than telling the truth, under the circumstances—Vīra-Vyav' 58 a).

Let him preserve, even by telling a lie, a Brahmaṇa who has sinned once through error and is in peril of his life. (Bṛhaspati 7-34).

No guilt is incurred by giving false evidence, in case the life of a man depends thereon.—But this rules does not hold good if the life of a very wicked man depends on the evidence.—(Gautama 13. 24-25).

SIGNS OF A FALSE WITNESS.

47. One who, weighed down by the consciousness of his guilt, looks as if he was ill, is constantly shifting his position and runs after people :—who walks about irresolutely and aimlessly and draws repeated sighs, who scratches the ground with his feet and who shakes his arms and clothes :—whose countenance changes colour, forehead sweats, whose lips become parched, who looks about and above himself :—who makes long irrelevant speeches, without being asked :—such a person is to be recognised as a *False witness* and admonished accordingly. -(Nārada. 193-196)

Not showing such signs, the witness need not be punished, because the nervousness evinced may be due to dread and such other natural causes, and not necessarily to consciousness of guilt—(Vira-Vya p. 196).

By external signs shall the king discover the internal disposition of men,—by their voice, their colour, their movements, their aspect, their eyes and their gestures :—(Manu 8. 25.)

All these signs only indicate the possibility of the man being unreliable ; they do not absolutely prove him to be so,—(Mitā. and Aparārka)

The man who moves from place to place, licks the ends of his mouth,—whose face changes colour, whose mouth becomes parched, who speaks haltingly, who speaks much and inconsistently, who pays no attention to what is said to him, who does not look towards others, who twists his lips, whose mind, body and acts are found to undergo a change:—such a person—whether a witness or an accused—should be regarded as unreliable,—(Yājña. 2. 13–15).

A false witness may be known by his altered looks, by his countenance changing colour and by his talk wandering from the subject.—(Viṣṇu 8. 187.)

Whatever faults there may be in witnesses should be exposed at the time of the trial; those cannot be teated as valid objections which are urged afterwards.—(Bṛhaspati 7. 25)

The incompetence of witnesses should be exposed by the defendant in the court itself; if the witnesses admit of the points raised, they cease to be witnesses; if they do not admit them, the points have to be proved by the defendant. If the latter fails to prove them, he should be fined.—(Vyāsa in Mayūkha, p. 38) The fine shall be the first amercement (Kātyāyana in Mayūkha, p. 39).

Those faults of the witnesses that are known to the Assessors,—or those that are quite perceptible, should be accepted by the judge, without their being proved by the defendant.—(Vyāsa in Mayūkha p. 38).

PUNISHMENT FOR PERJURY.

48. He who commits perjury through covetousness shall be fined one thousand *Paṇas*;—** if through † distraction, the lowest amercement;—if through fear, two middle amercements—through friendship four lowest amercements—if

---

* 'By the dependant'—(Mayūkha. p. 38),

** These are *Kārṣāpaṇas* (Aparārka p. 680),

† '*Moha*'—wrong information (Mitā 2-81)—absentmindedness (Krtyakalpataru)

through lust ten lowest * amercement;—if through wrath, three † second amercements;—if through ‡ ignorance, two hundred;—if through § childishness, one hundred *paṇas*.—‖ The King shall fine and banish men of the three lower castes who have given false evidence—but a Brāhmaṇa he shall only banish.—¶ (Manu 8. 120–123.)

A witness should be reprimanded and punished for speaking an untruth—(Gautama, 13–23.)

If a witness is found to be speaking an untruth, the king shall punish him—(Apastamba, 2. 11–29.8)

$ Witnesses who have perjured themselves should be severely punished with a fine which shall be double the value of the suit, but the Brāhmaṇa should be banished—(Yāñja 2.81).

---

* 250 Paṇas (Krtyakalpataru).

† 1500 Paṇas (Krtyakalpataru).

‡ *Ajñāna*—indefinite knowledge (Vīra–Vya, p. 180) or an error of judgment at the time of deposing (Krtyakalpataru).

§ '*Bālishya*'—want of experience and knowledge (Mitā, 2-81);—majority just attained (Krtyakalpataru)–'absence of all knowledge' (Vīra)

‖ This rule is meant for repeated offence (Mitā 2-8)–the preceding rule being meant for first offence–(Medhā and Vīra).

¶ *Pravasayet*—Put to death (Medhā and Mitā 2-81), such as cutting the lips, or the tongue and so forth, according to the gravity of the cases in which the man may have given false evidence (Ibid–also Vīramitrodaya Vyav).

'*Vivāsayet*'-deprive him of his clothes (Medhā, Mitā 2-81), or 'of his house' (ibid)—'Banished with all his belongings.' (Vivādachintāmaṇi p. 191).

$ Mitā. and Aparārka take the form *Kūṭakṛtsākṣiṇah* to mean 'the perjured witness and the party that has bribed him to do it.' It is added that this rule applies to the *first* offence; in the

If after having deposed, a witness is found to suffer* within a week, from fire or death in the family,—he should be made to pay the debt in dispute, as also a fine (Manu 28-108)

WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE.

49. A witness who, without being ill,† does not appear to give evidence in cases of loans and the like, within three fortnights after the summons, shall be held responsible for the whole debt‡ and pay a tenth part of the whole as fine§ to the king—(Manu 8. 107).

A man who does not give evidence should be made by the king to pay up the whole amount of the debt along with accrued interest, and also a fine consisting of the tenth part of that amount,—on the forty-sixth day after the receiving of summons. (Yājña 276)

If a man has been cited a witness, and the questions have been addressed to him, if he tries to dissuade other witnesses from giving evidence by telling them that he himself is not going to give evidence,—he should be fined eight times the

---

case of repeated offence, the penalties are as prescribed by Manu above (8, 120-123 .—Aparārka adds the *forger* also is included under '*Kutakrt* ').

[*] Any acute suffering*—Medhā.

[†] This indicates other disabilities also,—such as family—troubles, dread of the creditor and so forth.—Medhā.

State-oppression and Divine Oppression are also meant—Mitā-on 2-76.

Obstacles arising from natural causes or from some action of the king'—Vira-Vyava-P. 54 Cf. also Mitā-2-76.

[‡] Including interest—Smṛtichandrikā-Vya-P. 213.

[§] That is, the fine that would be payable by the defeated party should be paid by the recalcitrant witness.—Medhā.

fine laid down for recalcitrant witnesses; but the Brāhmaṇa[°] shall be[†] banished (Yajna 2-82)

He who conceals his knowledge at the time of the trial, although he has previously related what he knows to others, deserves specially heavy punishment,—being more criminal than a false witness (Nārada 1. 197)

If a witness, being summoned, does not appear, without being ill, he should be made to pay the debt and a fine after the lapse of three fortnights (Brhaspati. 7-31)

If on being questioned, the witnesses do not answer, they are guilty of a crime.—(Gautama 13-6)

EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES.

50. In the presence of deities and Brāhmaṇas, during the forenoon, the Judge, pure himself, shall ask the town-born persons who have been purified and are facing the North and the East, to give Evidence.—(Manu 8-87.)

The Investigating Judge shall question the witnesses assembled in the Court, in the presence of the Plaintiff and the Defendant,—gently exhorting them in the following manner —'What you know of the mutual transaction between these two persons regarding the suit,—all that you may declare freely,—since you are witness in this matter'. The witness telling the truth in his Evidence attains irreproachable regions (Manu 8-79—81 et. seq.)

The witnesses being assembled in the court in the presence of the two parties, the judge shall examine them exhorting them in the following manner :—' What you

---

[°] 'Who is unable to pay the said heavy fine'—Mitā.

[†] '*Vivāsana*'-may be depriving of clothes, demolition of his house, or banishment,—according to the gravity of the suit involved.—In the case of men of the other castes, if any one is unable to pay the heavy fine, he shall be made to work according to his caste, or put in chains or in prison- Mitā.

know to have been mutually transacted in this matter between the two men before us,—declare all that in accordance with the truth,—for you are witnesses in this cause.—A witness who speaks the truth in his evidence, gains after death the most excellent regions of bliss, and unsurpassable fame (while living); such testimony is respected by Brahmā himself.—He who gives false evidence is firmly bound in Varuṇa's fetters ' etc. etc. (Manu 8-79 et. seq.)

Some people declare that the witnesses shall be charged on oath to speak the truth.—(Gautama 13-12)

When the witnesses have been assembled near the Plaintiff and the Defendant, they shall be charged as follows :—' If a man gives false evidence, he goes to those regions that have been ordained for sinners and perpetrators heinous crimes, for incendiaries, and murderers of women and children ;—whatever spiritual merit thou mayest have acquired by means of hundreds of good deeds in thy previous lives—know that all that shall go over to the party against whom thou givest false evidence. '—(Yājña 2. 73. 75.)

In cases bearing upon the death of animals, the witnesses should be examined in the presence of the dead body.—(Kātyayana in Vira-Vya P. 168).

Witnesses shall be examined after they have been bound down firmly by oaths (Nārada 1-168).

The judge shall cause the Brāhmaṇa to swear* by his veracity, the Kṣattriya by his chariot or the animal he rides and by his weapons,—the Vaishya by his kine, grain and gold and the Shūdra by the guilt of all grievous sins ;—or recourse may be had to ordeals—(Manu 8.113-114).

---

* 'Swearing' here stands for the invoking of evil consequences upon oneself ; hence 'swearing by truth' means 'may all my merit due to truthfulness become annulled.'—Medhā.

18. To what the witnesses have seen collectively, they shall depose collectively ; to what they have seen severally, they shall depose severally—(Vashiṣtha in Vira—Vya- P. 168.)

19. Whenever false evidence is found to have been given in any suit, the judge shall reverse the judgement, and whatever may have been done shall be annulled.* Manu 8. 117).

20. Evidence given from covetousness, distraction, terror, friendship, lust, wrath, ignorance and childishness is declared to be invalid.—(Manu 8-118) also Viṣṇu 8-40).

The form of the oath taken by the man shall be in the form— ' what I shall say shall be the truth—Smrtitattva II, P. 611.

* 'Even though the case may have been decided, yet if, even subsquently, it be found that false evidence had been given the decision shall be reversed;—Mitā. on 2-77.

† · Even though the creditor has received the amount of debt claimed, he should be made to refund it, and the fine realised from the bebtor shall be refunded to him.—Medhā.

(C.) POSSESSION—BHOGA.

PART I.

POSSESSION IS PROOF.

1. What has been possessed in order, and with a legitimate title, the possessor may keep; it can never be taken from him.—(Viṣṇu 5·185)

2. If a dispute arises between two creditors concerning an immoveable property which has been mortgaged to both at the same time,—that mortgagee shall enjoy its produce who holds it in possession without having obtained it by force.—(Viṣṇu 5-184)

3. In regard to houses and lands,—the property belongs to him who has the possession; document is of no avail in that case. (Saṃvarta, quoted in Parāshara-mādhava—Vya. p. 108)

This only emphasises the futility of the document; it does not mean that the Possessor acquires ownership by mere Possession: as mere Possession can never create ownership; as laid down by Katyayana (see below under III)—(Parāshara-mādhava—Vya. p. 108).

PART II.

KINDS OF BHOGA.

4. Possession is of two kinds—(a) with title and (b) without title. That which has continued for three generations is self-sufficient; that which is of shorter duration should be supported by title.—(Kātyāyana in Parāsharamādhava—Vya. p. 103)

Possession which has continued for three generations is proof, even when not supported by Title ; but if it is of shorter duration, it can be admitted as proof only when supported by title. 'Three generations' stand for a period of sixty years or more. (See below).—(Parāsharamādhava—Vya. p. 103).

PART III.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ĀGAMA (TITLE), AND BHOGA (POSSESSION.)

5. There can be no branches without the root. Title is the root, and Possession is the branch.—(Kātyāyana in Parāsharamādhava Vya. p. 102).

This means that Possession can be proof only when suppored by Title. (Parāshārama. P. 102).

In the determining of ownership Title along with ownership is proof, not mere Possession—such is the sense of this text. (Aparārka, P. 635).

In regard to cattle, gold, lands and the rest, if one man is found in possesson, while Title arising from gift and other sources indicates the ownership of another,—it is Title that is more authoritative, and mere Possession is no proof of ownership. The eternal rule is that Possession does not create ownership ; what sort of Possession does create ownership has been described in Manu 8.147 (see below).—(Medhātithi).

Document, Witnesses and Possession having been described as Proof, the author proceeds to explain their relative strength- (a) In the first generation, Title proved by means of witnesses, is superior to Possession ;—(b) in the fourth generation Hereditary Possession, or Possession for generations, is superior to Title proved by means of Documents ;—(c) in the intervening generations (second and third), Title accompanied by even slight possession is superior to Title entirely without Possession (Mitā)

6. Where Possession is evident, but no sort of title is perceptible, there Title, not Possession, shall be the proof (Manu 8. 200).

7. * Title is superior to Possession, † except in

---

*This is the *second* alternative explanation of the text, given by the Mitākṣarā. The first explanation is as follows]

As proof of ownership Title is superior to Possession; because in determining ownership Possession requires the support of Title; mere Possession does not indicate ownership; as Possession can be based on force also.—This rule refers to 'time within memory' (see below).

† *Except etc.*—In some cases Possession is proof, even independently of Title; e, g. in cases where possession has continued through three generations (father, grandfather and great-grandfather), it is proof, even without Title; i. e. without *knowledge of Title.* This also has reference to 'time within memory.' Thus then the meaning is that in cases referring to 'time within memory', as it is possible to be sure of the non-existence of Title, Possession as proof depends upon the knowledge of Title; (c) but when it refers to 'time beyond memory', as it is not possible to be sure of the non-existence of Title, continued Possession is proof, independently of knowledge of Title. 'Time within memory'—is a period of a hundred years. Hence in cases refering to a period of time prior to the last hundred years, if it is proved that during all the time, of over 100 years, possession has continued without protest from and before the eyes of, the other parties concerned,—and the non-existence of Title being uncertain, the validity of the Possession remains unopposed,—such Possession is accepted as indicative of Title and hence of ownership.—But in cases dealing with 'time beyond memory' also,—if there has all along been a continuous notion that the possession is without title, then such Possession cannot be admitted as proof.—In fact it is only when continued Possession is supported by Title indicated by other proofs that, in course of time, it indicates ownership. But Title, even though recognised,—if it is not supported by Possess-

cases where Possession has continued for generations.[*]—

---

ion,—cannot indicate ownership, after the lapse of time ; as it is just possible that though the man may have had title over the property he might have renounced it during the intervening time, by sale or gift etc.

[*] Hence that Title which is not supported by even a slight degree of Possession, is not *strong*, not perfect, is deficient.—(Mita.)

What is meant is that if there is no form of Possession, the Title is deficient in its validity. (Vīramitrodaya-Vya p. 207). '*Except etc.*' the meaning is that Title is superior to such Possession as has continued only during 'time within memory'; mere Possession, without Title, not being productive of ownership. If it has continued during 'time beyond memory', there can be no certainty as to there being no title behind it, hence in that case Possession, continued and uncontroverted, does indicate ownership (Vīramitrodaya-Vya p. 207).

Twenty or Thirty or Forty years constitute 'one generation.' (Parāsharāmādhava-Vya p. 104).

(*a*) Mere Possession, without Title, can not prove the ownership of the Possessor over the property possessed by him ; because in the case of the enjoyment of the usufruct, we find such enjoyment even without actual ownership. (*b*) Possession needs he support of Title in the case of property other than those that have been possessed for several generations. (*c*) In a case where there is absolutely no trace of possession, no validity attaches to mere Title What is meant is as follows :—Even though it may be established by means of documentary and other evidence that originally the man has had a perfectly clear title derived from gift or such other valid sources, yet *present* ownership cannot be proved without Possession ; because it is just possible that the ownership may have been surrendered, during the interval, by means of gift or sale. Therefore in the proving of *present* ownership, Title needs the support of Possession—(Aparārka).

There is no strength (completeness, perfectness) in the Title, if there is not even a little of Possession. (Yājñavalkya 2. 27.)

8. Even when the Document is there, and witnesses are living to prove it, if there is no possession, there is no stability (to the title) ; specially in the case of immovable property :—(Nārada quoted in Vīramitrodaya-Vya-p. 207).

9. At first the source of ownership is Gift (and Purchase and the rest); in the middle, it is Possession accompanied by title; and in the end the only source of ownership is Possession which is continued and long-standing :—(Nārada quoted in Mitā. but attributed to Kātyāyana, in Aparārka).

(*a*) 'Title '—Document—'is superior to Possession';hence Document is definite as proof of ownership, while Possession is possible even without ownership. (*b*) But if the Possession has continued for generations, it is superior. '*Pūrvakrama*' of the Text, stands for *Possession during three generations*. (c) Documentary Title is *deficient*, if not supported by such degree of Possession as is essential for establishing the validity of the Title.—(Vishvarūpa).

Even though Gift, Purchase and the rest are self-sufficient as sources of ownership,, yet some sort of Possession is needed to establish it firmly. Because a gift, for instance, is not complete without acceptance on the part of the donee : and such acceptance should be mental, verbal as well as physical ; and physical acceptance of a gift means *enjoyment*, which implies some sort of Possession :—(Virā-Vya, P. 207).

The meaning is that in the fourth generation,, possession is the only proof that is to be adduced in proof of ownership ; but the possession should be such as has continued during 'time beyond memory.'—Aparārka p 636.

This verse shows what proof of ownership should be adduced by the three generations severally. By the first generation, Title ; by the second, Title and Possession : by the third, only Possession—Parāsharamādhava-Vya p. 107."

10. Possession becomes 'proof' (of ownership) only through pure Title.—(*Yājña* 2-29 according to Vishvarūpa, but *Nārada*, according to Mayūkha p. 30).

The '*impurity*' of the Title consists in its being disputed by the opposite party'—says Nārada himself as quoted in Virā. Vya p. 204.

The meaning of the text is that in establishing ownership, Possession depends upon Title.—Mitā on 2-27.

Possession becomes a *proof* only when supported by Title which is *pure* i.e. well-established.—(Aparārka, p. 635)

Evidential character belongs to such Possession only as is supported by well-established Title, and not to mere Possession.—Vishvarūpa.

11. Possession should fulfil five conditions: a' it should be supported by Title; (b) it should have continued for a long time, (c) there should have been no break in it; (d) there should have been no protest ever raised against it; and (e) it should be in the presence of the opposite party.—(Vyasa, in Mayukha p. 30.)

12. If a man adduce (as proof) only Possession, and not any sort of Title, he should be regarded as a thief, masquerading under the cloak of Possession.—(Nārada in Mayūkha P. 30).*

---

* What is meant is that mere Possession cannot establish a claim. This refers to a case dealing with such time during which Title, if existent, could be remembered.—(Mayūkha P. 30).

Mere Possession cannot indicate ownership; as Possession may have been obtained by force or stealth.—(Mitā.)

Possession should not only be supported by Title, it should fulfil other conditions also.—Mayukha p. 30.

This refers to possession by the first generation.—"Apararka, p. 636."

Possession is proof of ownership only when it fulfills all these five qualifications—"Mita."

13. * In cases falling within the memory of man, the proof (of ownership) over land is required to be *Possession with a Title.*—† In cases beyond the memory of time, Possession continued successively for three generations (is proof of ownership), on account of the absence of certainty (regarding absence of Title).—(Nārada in Mayūkha P. 30; Kātyāyana in Parāshara-Mādhava Vya, P. 104 and in Mitākṣarā.)

The qualification that Possession should be supported by Title,—and the charge laid against the man who does not adduce Title,—all this refers to a case where it is possible for people to remember the Title if it exists. This time has been held by Mitākṣarā to consist of the period of a hundred years. But we hold that the period meant must be that during which it may be possible for the knowledge of the Title to be handed down from father to son, even through a long succession of generations.—(Vīra-Vya).

In cases referring to time during which it is not possible to remember the Title, mere Possession also is proof; because in such cases it is impossible to be certain that no Title ever existed.—(Mayūkha P. 31)

* If there is Possession for any period less than a hundred years, it is not valid unless Title is shown. It is a period during which it is possible to prove Title by oral testimony; as men ninety or hundred years could be found to depose to the question as to how the Possession arose. If therefore, no Title could be proved when Possession has been held for less than a hundred years, it may be taken for certain that no Title ever existed.

† But in cases where Possession has continued for more than a hundred years, no witnesses could be available to depose to the origin of the Possession; and so in such cases it could not be asserted with any degree of certainty that no Title ever existed. Hence as *immemorial Possession* and Title are always concomitant without fail, there is a presumption in favour of Title in such cases.—Some sages (e.g. Vyāsa, Bṛhaspati, see above sec. 1)

14. A man who enjoys (possesses) a property without Title, even for many hundreds of years,—should be punished* like a thief.—(Narada 4. 87, and noted in Mayūkha P. 31)

---

have held that 'time beyond memory is the period of three generations beyond the present Possessor' i.e. his father, grandfather and great-grandfather. But this also should be regarded as only indicating the period of one hundred years; because if we took 'three generations' too literally, then in some cases, it may so happen that all the three ancestors of a man may die off in the course of a single year.—(Mitā—as explained by *Kane* in Mayūkha Notes P. 58).

'Time within memory' stands for time occupied by three generations; the period of 'possession by one generation' has been fixed by Nārada at twenty years; so that what is meant is that in cases where Possession has continued for over three generations, i. e. beyond sixty years, Title is not to be sought after. In fact Katyāyana has distinctly declared that 'Possession continuing for sixty years becomes irrevocably fixed.' Hence 'time within sixty years' is time 'within memory', and 'beyond sixty years is 'time beyond memory.'—Or on the strength of another Smṛti we may regard *thirty-five* years as 'one generation of Possession'; so that a hundred and five years could be 'time within memory', and over that, 'time beyond memory.'—(Aparārka.)

Parāshara-mādhava (Vya. P. 105) fixes the period at 150 years.

*Even in cases of Possession beyond the memory of man, if there is a long—continued persistence of the notion that the Possession is without Title, that Possession cannot be regarded as proof. The penalty here prescribed should be inflicted in all such cases.—This verse re-iterates the position that Possession without Title cannot establish ownership.—(Mita.)

15. Even in the absence of title, if a property has been in total possession by three ancestors, it cannot be recovered, having passed from one generation to another, for three generations,*—(Nārada, 4-91)

This text means that the first man who wrongly usurps without title should be fined,—his sons and grandsons should not be fined, only the property shall be taken away from them ; though they may have enjoyed it very long ; provided there is certainty that there was no title to begin with.—(Apararka P. 637).

This view of *Aparārka* is not accepted by Vīramitrodaya (Vya. P. 206.)

'What is meant by *Possession extending over hundreds of years* is long-standing possession by one and the same person ; and such Possession cannot prove ownership unless there has been possession by his father and grand-father also. *Hundreds of years* stands for a *long period of time*. The upshot is that in the first generation of the Possessor, mere Possession, even though extending over twenty years or more, does not establish ownership ; so also in the second generation'.—(Medhatithi on Manu 8-148.)

*As it stands this text should go under Part IV ; but according to the explanation of it by commentators and digest—writers, it has been placed here.

The direct literal meaning has not been accepted by the commentators or digest—writers, as a rule ; because it is in direct conflict with section 13. It has therefore been explained as a figurative supplement to the foregoing : the meaning being—'when what has been wrongly enjoyed for three generations cannot be recovered, how much more impossible is it to restore what has been enjoyed for three generations, and about which there is no certainty that there was no title to begin with ?' So that the present text does not lay down the impossibility of recovering what is wrongly possessed, but to declare that Possession extending over three generations does confer ownership

16. In Law, Possession is valid if it is unbroken and longstanding. Even when broken, it should be regarded as valid, if it has been previously proved.—Bṛhaspati in Parāsharamādhava Vya. P. 106).

17. Neither the first usurper nor his son should lay stress upon Possession, in the case of such property as cattle, slaves,—male and female, and so forth*.—(Kātyayāna in Mita.)

PART IV.

Possession through generations establishes Title.

18. If Possession of an Estate has been held by three generations in due course, the fourth in descent shall retain it as his property—even without a written Title.—(Viṣṇu, 5-187).

19. When property has been held in lawful possession by the Father, the son's right to it, after his death, cannot be contested; as it has become his own by rightful possession.—(Viṣṇu 5. 186).

---

when there is uncertainty as to the unlawful character of the initial possession —(Mayūkha P. 31 and Mitā. 2·24; also Parasharamadhava—Vya. p. 105.)

In all these texts, where Possession is mentioned as 'extending over three generations,' it is 'time within memory' that is meant.—(Vīramitrodaya and Mitākṣarā.)

'Title.' '*Nyāya,*' here stands for deed of gift and so forth. In the absence of such Title, what has been enjoyed by one's father, grand-father and great-grand-father becomes the rightful property of the fourth generation;—and this does not happen after two years only. Such is the meaning of this text.—(Medhātithi on Manu 8-147.)

* This also implies that Possession without Title does not create ownership.—(Bālambhaṭṭi.)

20. If a property has been enjoyed (possessed), without perceptible Title, by one's three ancestors, then it cannot be taken away from him,—it having come to him, in due course, through three generations.*—(Hārīta, in Mitā ; but Vyāsa in Aparārka P. 637).

21. That man who acquired a title over a certain property, should prove it, when he is impugned (proceeded

---

Compare Sec. 13 and 15 above.

The phrase '*atyantaṃ āgamaṃ vinā*' of the present Text has been explained by Mayūkha (P. 3.) and Mitākṣarā (2-24) to mean 'without perceptible title', and not as absolutely 'without title': as in the latter case it has been declared that 'Possession without any Tttle, even though extending over hundreds of years does not confer ownership'—(see under sec. 10—13 above).

Even though the first ancestor who took possession of the property may have had no title, yet as regards his descendants, if they have established their possession extending over a hundred years,—then the property cannot be taken away from the fourth descendant ;—the reason for this being that after the lapse of such a long time, there can be no certainty as to there having been no Title behind the initial possession ; it is only when this latter fact is quite certain that Possession can be rejected as proof of ownership. If however even after the lapse of a hundred years, it can be proved to a certainty that there never was any title behind the first possession, then Possession has to be rejected and the property taken away from the man in possession,—(Aparārka P. 637).

Vīramitrodaya (P. 207), agreeing with Mitākṣarā and Mayūkha, remarks—This text must be taken to refer to 'absence of such Title as existed, but cannot be produced', that is to say, when there is no certainty as to there having been no Title at all. Ownership is established by only such Possession as fulfils certain conditions, the chief of which is that it is supported against); his son, or his son's son, is not required to prove the title; in their case, Possession is more important.[*]—(Yājña. 2-28).

---

by proved Title.—Mere Title, without Possession, even though proved by witnesses, cannot establish ownership, as ownership may have been relinquished by means of sale or gift after acquisition by the Title.

[*] The idea is that the first acquirer, if he does not prove title, may be fined for unlawfully usurping possession: but the son and the grandson cannot be fined for the wrongful act of their ascestor; they should rely upon Possession; if they can prove that, they will not incur the penalty. But this does not mean that they will retain the property; because their Possession not having ripened by continuance during three generations, they lose the property, if they cannot prove Title also, along with the Possession.—(Mayukha—Notes—Kane P, 62).

The acquirer, when questioned, should 'prove' his Title, by means of evidence, documentary and oral. This means that if the first acquirer is unable to prove his title, he should be fined. His son, however, if sued regarding the Property, should have to prove, not the Title, but only continuous unmolested Possesson. So that the second generation is to be punished only if he fails to prove such Possession, not if he does not prove the Title. As regards the grandson of the acquirer, he should have to prove neither Title nor continuous unobstructed Possession, but only hereditary possession; and it is only if he fails to prove this that he incurs penalty.—In the case of the son and the grandson, therefore, Possession is 'more important'.—But in all three cases, the possessor loses the property if he cannot prove the Title; it is only in the matter of punishment that a distinction has to be made in the three cases. (See Sec. 24 below).—(Mitā.)

'*In their case Possession is more important*'.—That is, it is proof of ownership, even if Title cannot be proved. As a general rule, Possession has been held to be proof of ownership; and Pledges, Deposits &c. have been laid down as exceptions to this

22. If a person in possession is sued for the property, but before the suit is decided, he dies,—then his heir should prove the title. In this case mere Possession, devoid of Title, cannot be a valid proof (of ownership).*—(Yājña. 2-29).

23. The first acquirer should prove, in court, Title as well as Possession:—his son should prove Possession only:†—

---

rule (see below); hence the evidential character of Possession can be besmirched only in a case where it is definitely proved, by means of oral and other evidence, that the case in question is one of Pledge or Deposit and so forth. Thus in the case mentioned in the present text, ownership of the acquirer's son and grandson is held to be proved by Possession only.—This however is to be taken as refering to the case of possession extending during 'time beyond memory'—i.e. over more than 'three generations', (or for more than a hundered years).—Aparārka P. 337).

The son of the man who got the deed (of sale or gift) executed in his favour should not be called upon to refute any charges that may be made against the deed; because the son is not expected to know the details of the original transaction. But the son loses the property, if he is unable to answer the objections. As regards the grandson, however, he does not lose the property either; as in his case 'Possession is more important'—(Vishvarūpa).

* 'In this case, mere Possession devoid of Title,'—even though proved by witnesses and other Evidence, is not valid; its validity having been impugned by the institution of the suit. This has been distinctly declared also by Nārada (1-93)—'If a man sued happen to die, his son should prove his case; the onus cannot disposed of by mere Possession'.—(Mitā.)

In as much as mere Possession would not be sufficient to establish ownership, the son will have to adduce full evidence in support of his ownership.—(Aparārka p. 638.)

† What is said here in regard to the son pertains to Possession during 'time within memory'; and what is said regarding the

his grandson shall have to prove nothing.—(Bṛhaspati in Aparārka p. 636):

24. If he who has acquired title over a property, fails to prove the title, he should be punished:—not his son or grandson ; though these two also lose the property.*—(Hārīta in Mayūkha p. 32.)

25. If a man sees, without protesting, his landed property being enjoyed by another,† he loses it after

---

grandson pertains to Possession extending over 'time beyond memory.'—(Aparārka. p. 636.)

* See Sec. 21 above and notes thereon.

†'*Another*'—a person not related to him.

This text apparently conflicts with the principle, generally acknowledged, that it is only Possesion extending over a hundred years that creates ownership. Hence Mitākṣarā and Mayūkha and Vīramitrodaya have interpreted 'losing' to mean 'loss of the produce of the land,' not of *ownership*. That is, if A is in unlawful possession of B's land, before the eyes of B, who does not protest against it, then if B files a suit after twenty years (but before a hundred years), he may succeed in recovering the land, but the profits of the land he cannot recover. If the owner had gone abroad and came after twenty years, he would be able to recover the produce also—as he could not have 'seen' the property being enjoyed by another.—Similarly, if B's land was usurped and he protested against it, then even after twenty years, he would be entitled to compensation for the produce,—because it would not be a case of his 'not protesting'. Within twenty years, he could be entitled to recover the produce in any case.—(Kane Mayūkha-Notes p. 62.)

Aparārka would make the unprotesting man lose his entire ownership also—not only his right to the produce.

Medhātithi (under Manu 8-149) has discussed this text very fully, in all its various interpretations, and finally come to the following conclusion :—In as much as the various rules twenty years ; chattels are lost in ten years.—(Yājña 2-24).

26. If the real owner ignores enjoyment of his property by another, and remains silent (not protesting against it), then, after the lapse of the said time, his suit cannot succeed* (Nārada in Mitā. 2. 24).

27. If a man's landed property has been enjoyed by another, for twenty years,—while a powerful king is reigning—his rights over that property cannot be established.—(Vyāsa in Aparārka, P. 612, and Vīra-Vya—P. 209).

28. If a landed property is enjoyed, without obstruction, in the presence of the rightful owner, by another person, for three generations,—then it should not be taken away from the man in possession.—(Bṛhaspati in Parāsharamādhava–Vya. P. 108).

29. Whatever thing the owner meekly sees being used by others in his presence, for ten years,—that thing he does not deserve to recover.†—(Manu, 8. 147).

---

bearing upon this subject are found to be incompatible with one another, what has got to be ascertained in each case is if there is any clear title to ownership,—and in the event of there being no title, if there is undisturbed possession. If it is, then the decision must proceed on the basis of such Possession only.

° '*His suit cannot succeed*'—i. e. he cannot establish his ownership, which would be the outcome of the suit.—(Aparārka P 632).

† *Whatever thing*,—all kinds of property—slaves, utensils, gold, silver &c.—'*Meekly*'—i.e. without filing a suit, or protesting to the man—'Why are you using my property ?'—'*He does not deserve to recover it*'—i.e. his ownership entirely ceases. 'Seeing' here denotes *knowledge*.—'*By others*'—i.e. by persons who are not his collaterals. nor his *relatives* (according to some, but not accepted by Medhātithi). What happens in this case is described in Manu 8. 148 (See Sec. 31, below).

30. If a man, through foolishness, ignores the enjoyment of his properties by others, under his very eyes,—he is completely over-powered (ousted) by such Enjoyment (Possession).—(Nārada in Vīra—Vya, P. 209).

31. If the owner is neither an idiot nor a minor,*—and the property is used in his own country,—it becomes

---

* '*Idiot*' and the rest are mentioned only by way of illustration ; what are meant are persons who are unable to look after their own interests.—'*In his own country*'—i.e. if both parties are inhabitants of the same country; the meaning being that 'in cases where it is possible for the owner to be cognisant of the fact that his property is being used by another, if the enjoyment continues for ten years (sec. 29), the ownership passes to the user. [After discussing the several contradictory texts bearing upon the question, Medhātithi concludes thus]. What has got to be ascertained in each case is—if there is any clear title to ownership of the dispossessed party?—if none, has the property been in the possession of the other party for over ten years?—if yes, then, the decision must proceed on the basis of Possession only. Thus it is that possession for three generations creates ownership in all cases.—[A peculiar case is next cited]—In a case where both parties are absolutely without title, and are asserting their rights by sheer force,—the prior possession, even though of older standing, is set aside by the twenty years' possession, which is more recent and hence less open to doubt.—(Medhā. on 8.148)

What is meant is that the dispossessed man loses his suit,—not that he loses the property entirely. The non-suiting comes about in the following manner :—The man in possession says—'This man is not an idiot &c.—in his presence I have been using this property for twenty years, in support of which I can produce many witnesses,—if I have been using his property frustrated in law, and the user becomes entitled to the property.—(Manu, 8. 148).

32. The property of one who is neither an idiot nor a minor, having been used by strangers before his eyes for ten years,—belongs to him who uses it;—but not if it is used by Shrotriyas, ascetics or royal officials.—Animals, land and women are not lost by adverse possession.—(Gautama, 12. 37-39.)

PART V.

Exception to Possession as Proof.

33. Where the property is in the use of men of the owner's own caste, or by his collaterals or relations,—ownership is not established by Possession;—it is only in cases of possession by others* (strangers) that ownership is so established.—(Kātyāyana in Vira—Vya. P. 221.)

34. Pledges and Deposits should not suffer much†

---

unlawfully, why did he not protest against it so long?'—and to this the other party can give no suitable answer.

* 'Others'—persons not related, strangers. In the case of relatives, the owner may be ignoring the unlawful enjoyment by reason of his regard for the relative, and so forth; hence he should not suffer for this —(Vira—Vya, P. 221).

†The 'time' for redeeming the pledge is just when the principal, with accrued interest, has doubled itself; and there is 'lapse' of this time if the thing is not redeemed then.—For Deposit also, the right time to recover it is before the other party has occasion to think that the thing belongs to himself by reason of his having the use of it; beyond this time there is 'lapse of of time.'—'What is stated here is only a friendly advice; as a matter of fact, there can never be an 'appropriation' of Pledges and Deposits by any 'lapse of time' (see Manu 8. 149—next

lapse of time ; as being left over for a long time, they would be liable to appropriation.—(Manu 8-145.)

35. A pledge, a boundary, minor's property, a deposit, a property enjoyed by favour, women, King's property and the property of a Shrotriya are not lost by adverse possession. —(Manu. 8-149.)

36. A pledge, a boundary, an open deposit, the property of an idiot, the property of a minor, sealed deposit, the King's property, the property of women and the property of Shrotriyas—these are exceptions [to the * rule that property is lost by adverse possession extending over twenty years.—See sec. 25] (Yājña. 2.25.)

37. Even the pledge and other things,† if used by the other party in the presence of the pledger, for twenty years,

---

section).—Others have explained that this text (sec. 34) refers to Pledges only,—those cases where the Debtor, secure in the belief that the Principal cannot increase any further, through sheer wickedness, delays re-deeming ; in all such cases there should be ' appropriation ' by the Pledgee. That is, if the debtor refuses to redeem, through such wicked motives, his right over the pledge should cease.

* In these cases, there being no possibility of any fault of the owner, the property cannot be lost by adverse possession. (Mītā.)

In these cases, adverse possession does not lead to loss of ownership.—(Vishvarūpa.)

In the case of a Pledge that can be used, the very fact of the thing having been pledged is a justification for the debtor not protesting against the use.—In the case of sealed Deposits, their using involves a deliquency on the part of the Pledge, not on that of the debtor.—In the case of the property of the idiot and the like, the absence of protest is due to pure ignorance. —(Vīra-Vya-P. 220.)

† The meaning of this is that even Pledges and such other unforfeitable things become forfeited by adverse possession

become forfeited (to the owner) ; except in the case of the property of the King and the property of women.—(Nārada in *Aparārka* P. 632.)

38. Things used through favour are never forfeited; such as a milch cow, a camel, an ox, or the animal that is made over for breaking in.*—(Manu, 8-146).

39. When such things as riding animals, and ornaments are lent for use, through affection, they should be returned within four or five years ; † or else, they become liable to forfeiture.—(Marichi in Parasharamadhava Vya. P. 109.)

40. Such articles do not become forfeited as have been lent for use to Shrotiyas, to royal officials, to friends, to relations.—(Vyāsa in Parāsharamādhava—Vya, P. 109.)

41. Houses, lands and such things, which are used, without title, by friends, relations or collaterals, do not become forfeited by use.—(Bṛhaspati in Parāsharamādhava Vya. P. 109.)

---

extending over twenty years,—what to say of other kinds of property ?—Hence in the case of all property, besides Pledges and the like, long standing Possession must be regarded as establishing ownership—It does not mean that Pledges &c. actually become forfeited —(Aparārka P. 632.)

* Though the cow &c. mentioned are already included under 'Deposit' mentioned in Manu 8-149 (Sec. 35 above), yet they are specially emphasised here.—Some people have held the view that this text lays down an option to the general rule in 149 ;—the meaning being that in the case of things other than those mentioned here in 146, specifically, there *is* forfeiture sometimes ; e.g. when clothes used through favour, become torn and are thereby lost.—(Medhatithi).

† This lays down a curtailment of the period of ten years laid down by Yājñavalkya (see sec. 25, above) ; and sec. 38 (Manu 8-146) is an exception to what is laid down by Marīchi (sec. 39)—(Parāsharamadhava-Vya-P. 109).

V.—THE MĪMĀMṢĀ MANUSCRIPTS IN THE GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY

(BENARES)

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ.

The Mīmāṃsā Collection of manuscripts in the Library of the Government Sanskrit College, Benares, as represented in the Catalogue, recently published, comprises 572 mansucripts. This includes all the works on the subject which were acquired annually and from time to time and which hitherto formed part of different sections of the Library. Considering that a complete and exhaustive Catalogue of the Library in each of its classes should bring together all the works belonging to the class concerned an endeavour has been made to amalgamate all the sections so far as manuscripts of the particular class are concerned.

A mere glance at the contents of the Catalogue will suffice to convince one that the Mīmāṃsā Collection is as rich as it is valuable. There are 64 dated manuscripts in this Collection, of which *one* belongs to the 15th century, *eight* to the 16th, *sixteen* to the 17th, *six* to the eighteenth, *twenty-eight* to the 19th and *five* to the 20th century.

IMPORTANT AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS.

Jaimini, the author of the Sūtras —We must start with the Mīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini. This work represents a body of aphorisms, as such works invariably are, and is divided, so far as the current portion goes, into 12 chapters, for which reason it is known as **द्वादशलक्षणी**. Each of these chapters is sub-divided into pādas which vary. Of this work there are 13 manuscripts in the present Collection (nos. 1 to 13)

Śabara Muni's Bhāṣya.—The earliest and most authoritative commentary extant on the above is the Bhāṣya attributed to Śabara Muni, of which there are 57 manuscripts in the present Collection (nos. 14 to 70). The date of the author is not definitely known, nor any thing about his nationality.

Other Commentaries on the Sūtras.—Besides Śabara's work which is indeed the standard commentary on the Sūtras there are numerous glosses on these Sūtras, of which we have no less than twenty-two, viz. those by Pārthasārathi, Mādhavāchārya, Bhavanātha, Dinakara, Nīlakaṇṭha, Gāgā Bhaṭṭa, Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa II, Ananta Bhaṭṭa, Khaṇḍa Deva (two works), Bhāskara Rāya, Rāghavānanda, Viśvakarmā, Brahmānanda, Vaidyanātha Tatsat, Vāsudeva Dīkṣita, Divākara Dīkṣita, Rāmeśvara Kavi and four glosses the authorship of which is not known.

Differences of interpretation : Prabhākara, Kumārila, and Murāri.—There are two, or probably three, distinct lines of interpretation in the Mīmāṃsā school, represented by Bhaṭṭa Kumārila, Prabhākara and Murāri Miśra. Murāri's School, except for some doubtful books associated with this name, is practically defunct. All that we know of him and his views is from references and quotations in later literature.*

Prabhākara and his School—Prabhākara's school too is practically non-existent, except for its surviving literature. Kumārila alone rules the field. But Prabhākara's influence was once enormous. And in the History of Indian Philosophy his place is unique. He is generally known as "Guru" and is probably to be associated with Kashmir or its neighbourhood*.

---

* " मुरारेस्तृतीयः पन्थाः " has become almost a proverb in Sanskrit. That Murāri was a great author, and not merely a dialectician, may be presumed (cf. Catalogue of the Deccan College Library).

Śālikānātha.—His school is represented in the present Collection by manuscript, no. 493, a copy of Prakaraṇapañchikā, written by Śālikānātha. Śālika's age and nationality have to be determined. The earliest reference to Śālika is probably to be found in Udayanāchārya's Nyāyakusumāñjali (Stavaka III). As I have already pointed out in my Introduction (pages vii—ix) to Varadarāja's Kusumāñjalibodhanī (the Princess of Wales Sarasvatī Bhavana Texts, no. 4), the nature of the reference seems to indicate not only that Śālika was Udayana's contemporary or at best an immediate predecessor but also that he was a native of Bengal. Udayana lived about the end of the 10th century, his Lakṣaṇāvalī being dated in Śaka 906 (तर्काम्बराङ्क) or 984 A. D. It is therefore probable that Śālika belonged to the middle of the 10th century. Besides the Pañchikā referred to above, Śālika was the author of a commentary on each of the two *ṭīkās* (Bṛhatī and Laghvî) of Prabhākara. These commentaries are known as Ṛjuvimalā and Dîpaśikhā respectively (cf. Mādhava's Sarvadarśanakaumudî and Rāmānuja's Tantrarahasya).

---

*As to the relative priority of Kumārila and Prabhākara there are wide differences of opinion. The reader is referred for a discussion of this point to the following: Gaṅgānātha Jhā, The Prabhākara School of Mīmānsā; A. B. Keith, The Karma Mīmānsā; Kuppuswami S'āstri in the Proceedings of the Oriental Conference, Vol. II; Gopinatha Kaviraj, Introduction to the English Translation of Tantravārtika (Bibliotheca Indica), pages xiv—xvi. According to Mādhava's Sarvadarśanakaumudī Prabhākara was the author of two commentaries on S'abara Bhāṣya—viz. (1) Vivaraṇa, in 6,000 ślokas, and (2) Nibandhana, in 12,000 ślokas. Bṛhatī is another name of this Vivaraṇa (cf. Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, pages 477-478. But it seems probable that Nibandhana was from another pen. Vāchaspati in the Nyāyakaṇikā and Pārtha Sārathi in the Nyāyaratnamālā refers to the two authors as distinct. But Rāmānuja also in the Tantrarabasya attributes to Prabhākara two commentaries on the Bhāṣya, a bigger one called Bṛhatī and a smaller one called Laghvī. There is apparently no difficulty about the identity of the Vivaraṇa and Bṛhatī. But if the Nibandhan is really proved to be from a different pen, the second and smaller commentary, to which both Mādhava and Rāmānuja refer, remains still to be determined.

Bhavanātha Miśra : *Nayaviveka.*—Subsequent to Śālikanātha Bhavanātha was a great advocate of the Prabhākara school of Mîmāṃsā. His Mîmāṃsā Naya Viveka, of which we have three manuscripts (nos. 189 to 191), is a commentary on the Sūtras, He is called a Mahāmahopādhyāya or simply Mahopādhyāya. In the Colophons of the manuscripts he is sometimes named Bhavadeva Upādhyāya (cf Colophons at the end of V. 2 to 4, VI. 1 and 2). But there appears to be no doubt that both Bhavanâtha and Bhavadeva were variants of the same name. It may be pointed out in this connection that Varadarâja, who was the author of a commentary on Bhavanâtha's work. speaks of Bhavadeva and Bhavanâtha as identical. Thus नाथं भवं occurs in verse 5 of his benediction and भवदेव in verse 10.

Some scholars are inclined to take this author to be the same as the father of Śaṅkara Miśra, the famous author of Upaskāra, Ātmatattvavivekakalpalatā, etc. But beyond a similarity of name there appears to be no plausible ground on which this identity may be established. Pratyaksvarūpāchārya refers to Bhavanātha and to the Nayaviveka in his commentary, called Nayanaprasādinī, on Chitsukha's

Tattvapradīpikā. Pratyaksvarūpa's date being the 14th century, the date of Bhavanātha must be about 1200 A.D. or the beginning of 1400 A.D. In that case he cannot have been the father of Śaṅkara Miśra who lived about the middle of the 15th Century.

Commentaries on Nayaviveka—(a) by Varadarāja.—The present collection contains four commentaries on the Nayaviveka. Of these the one, called Dīpikā, is by Varadarāja, son of Raṅganātha, son of Devanātha, son of Praṇatārtihara of Kiḍamli* family on the bank of the river Śukā. He was a follower of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism, and his Guru was one Sudarśana of Atrikula. † Varadarāja claims that his interpretation is supported by tradition and is **साम्प्रदायिक**. ‡ He refers to Chandra and other writers of Nibandhas. His commentary extends to the Tripādî section only, which is the most difficult portion of Bhavadeva's work.

(*b*) *By Śāṅkara*—There is another commentary on the Nayaviveka called Śaṅkâdîpikā (nos. 411 and 412). Nothing is known about this author except that he was a pupil of one Rāmārya and Govindopādhyāya Cf. Hall, p. 180.

---

* Dr. Hultzsch's manuscript (Report, no. II, page 137) reads it as Tigambi family and the name of the river appears there as Śakā. The Colophon of the Manuscript noticed by Dr. Hultzsch reads इत्याकोयस्य सुदर्श, from which it would seem that Varadarāja was of Atri family.

† This Varada is to be distinguished from the famous Varadâchârya of Vatsya family who was the author of "Tattvanirṇaya" and was the nephew and pupil of the great Râmānuja. Sudarśana, the writer of Śrutaprakâsikâ, a commentary on the Śrī Bhāṣya, was the pupil of this Varada.

‡ He says plainly that though he is able to write an independent treatise on the subject (विधान्तरं) he is satisfied with writing a commentary only, simply to give out the traditional view which is not generally known (सम्प्रदायोऽत्र दुर्लभः संप्रकाश्यते).

(c) *By Dāmodara.*—The third commentary is by Damodara Sūri, son of Mâdhava Yogin, and is called Alaṅkâra (nos. 413 and 414). The author is probably identical with the writer of a commentary on the Mîmâṃsâ Sūtras (धर्ममीमांसावृत्ति), called सुबोधिका (Peterson, Ulwar Catalogue, page 14).

(d) *By an unknown author.*—The authorship of the fourth commentary is not known (nos. 415 and 416).

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, his S'lokavārtika, Tantra Vārtika, Ṭupṭīkā and Laghuvārtika.—The greatest name however in the history of Pūrva Mimâṃsâ is undoubtedly that of Kumârila Bhaṭṭa, called Kumâra Svâmî by Pârthasârathi in his Nyâyaratnamâlâ. He was the author of a series of expositions on the Bhâṣya, known as Vârtika. His Śloka-vârtika, on chapter I, pâda I, is in verse. This is the best philosophical presentation of the Bhâṭṭa system on which all subsequent treatises are bassd There are four manuscripts of this work in the present collection (nos. 278-1281). S'lokavārtika stops at the end of pâda 1. With pâda 2, begins Tantravârtika, the *magnum opus* of Kumārila, a work which has proved to be a veritable mine of information to all Mimāṃsā authors of later ages. It extends to chapter III. The remaining portion of Jaimini's work is discussed in his Ṭupṭîkâ. There are 48 manuscripts of Tantravārtika (nos. 282—329) and five of Ṭupṭîkā (nos. 330—334). There is also a Laghuvârtika attributed to Kumâra Svamî).*

---

* The S'loka Vârtika is otherwise known as Kârikā and the Tantra Vârtika as Tantraṭīkâ. Kumārila was perhaps also the author of two works—one, the Bṛhaṭṭīkâ and the other, the Madhyamaṭikâ. These are now lost and were attributed to him by Kriṣṇa Deva in the Tantra Chūdâmaṇi and by Mâdhava Bhâratī in the Sarvadarsana Kaumudi (See Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference, pages 475 and 529).

Kumârila is usually supposed to be a contemporary of Saṅkarāchârya. Tradition says that he was defeated in a controversy with Śaṅkara and that he burned himself on a pyre before the latter's eyes. Śaṅkara's date is still an open question. Assuming that Śaṅkara lived towards the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century, it would follow that Kumârila belonged to the middle of the 8th century.*

The line so laboriously inaugurated by Kumârila seems to have practically died with him. His true aim of life, as that of every sincere advocate of Mîmâṃsâ, was to revive in his own way the Vedic religion in its ritualistic and sacrificial aspects—aspects which suffered a deadly set-back owing to the rise and development of Buddhism and Jainism. In Kumârila's time Buddhist philosophy was flourishing, especially at centres like Nâlanda, and we find in the Śloka-Vârtika clearest indications of Kumârila's very close acquaintance with it. How far Kumârila or Śaṅkara really succeeded in demolishing the structure of Buddhist religious thought the future historian of Indian culture will be able to say.

Dark Age: Mādhavāchārya and his Nyāyamālāvistara.—In any case it is strange that the Mîmâṃsâ school does not seem to have thrived well immediately after Kumârila's age So far as the literary history of the system is concerned the period from Kumârila to Mâdhavâchârya is, save for a few illustrious names, practically a total blank. The next author, therefore, which calls for our attention after Kumârila is probably Mâdhavâchârya, of whose Jaiminîya Nyâyamālā there are 37 manuscripts (nos. 152-188) in the Library. In mediæval Sanskrit literature, more particularly in the Vedic and Vedantic literature, Mādhava occupies a unique position. His contribution to the revival of Vedic culture in the country can be truly appreciated if only we remember that, as we have just pointed out, inspite of Kumārila's best efforts to introduce Vedic studies, there was a long and dark period immediately after Kumârila's death. It may be freely admitted that between the 8th century, when Kumârila lived and worked, and the 14th, the age of Mâdhavâchârya, i.e., for a period extending over 500 or 550 years, Vedic religion had again gone to sleep. That Bengal, under Buddhist and Tantric influences, lost its Vedic culture, is probably certain. But it is of interest to note that even from Southern India Vedic traditions disappeared. The rise of Pāñcharâtra Āgama, including as an offshoot the Śrî Vaiṣṇava system, and of the Vîraśaiva cult, and the spread of Jainism, had much to do with the decline of Vedism in the south. The families of Mâdhava and of his patron Bukka Rāya of Vijayanagara are associated with this revivalistic movement. The preparation of cyclopaedic commentaries on the Vedic Saṃhitâs and Brāhmaṇas is only a step in the direction of this renaissance. The study of Mîmâṃsā Sūtras having ceased with the cessation of interest in the ceremonies the meaning of the Sūtras became in course of time obscure. Mādhava's chief object in composition of the Nyâyaratnamālâ was to supply the adhikaraṇas in succession so as to render intelligible the context of the Sūtras.

---

* For a detailed study of the date of Kumârila and of certain episodes in the story of his life, see my "Introduction" to the English translation of Tantravârtika, published in the Bibliotheca Indica Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Pârtha Sârathi.—Parthasârathi Miśra was a famous writer of Mîmāṃsā in mediaeval India. In the present Collection we have 81 Mss. of his Śāstradîpikā (nos 71 to 151), 12 of his Tantraratna (nos. 336 to 347) and four of his Nyāya-(or Naya) ratnamālā (nos. 486 to 489). The Śāstradīpikā is one of the best glosses on the Sūtras explained from the view-point of Kumārila. The Tantraratna is a commentary on the Śabara Bhāṣya, or rather on the Ṭupṭīkā, and the Nyāya-ratnamālā is an independent treatise dealing with the main topics of Mīmāṃsā.

Very little historical information is available regarding Pārthasārathi. He calls himself the son and pupil of Yajñātman and was probably a native of Mithilā. A manuscript of his Tantraratna existing in the Library of the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, bears Saṃvat 1651 or 1594 A.D. (Catalogue of Calcutta Sanskrit College, Indian Philosophy, no. 184, page 117). The India office manuscript of Nyāyaratnamālā is dated in Saṃvat 1591 or 1534 A.D. Mādhavāchārya (1500 A.D.) refers to him in the Nyāyamālā ; so does Pratyaksvarūpa (1400 A. D.) in the Nayanaprasâdinī. Parthasârathi may be assigned, therefore, to the 13th century at the latest.

Commentaries on his (i) Śāstradīpikā and (ii) Tantraratna.—On his Śâstradīpikâ we have commentaries by Nârâyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa, Kamalâkara Bhaṭṭa, Râma Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, Champaka Nâtha, Vaidya Nâtha Tatsat and Soma Nātha.

The commentaries on the Tantraratna are by

Someśvara alias Rāṇaka.—The name of Pârtha Sârathi suggests that of Bhaṭṭa Someśvâra, son of Mâdhava Bhaṭṭa[*], who is held as his rival in the field of Mîmâṃsâ by subsequent authors. His Nyâyasudhâ [†], of which we have 33 manuscripts (nos. 437—469), is a commentary on the Tantravârtika. He is referred to very disparagingly, viz., as a plagiarist

---

[*] Called by Someśvara himself त्रिकाण्डमीमांसामण्डनप्रतिवसन्तसोमयाजी ।

[†] Also called Sarvopakāriṇî or Sarvânavadyakâriṇī.

(राणक चौर्य) by Kamalâkara (1612 A.D.) in his Āloka on the Śâśtradipikâ and also by Ananta Deva II in his Bhâṭṭâlańkâra, by Râmakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa in his commentary on the Śaśtradīpikā, and by Pratyaksvarūpa (1400 A D.) in the Nayanaprasâdinî.

Someśvara thus appears to belong to the age in which Pârthasârathi lived.

Sucharita Miśra and his Kāśikā—To the same age may be assigned the name of Upâdhyâya Sucharita, Miśra of whose commentary, called Kāśikâ, on Kumârila's Ślokavârtika, we have three manuscripts (nos. 432 to 434). Of these manuscripts no. 433 is dated Saṃvat 1507 (see fol. 876) or 1450 A.D. Râmakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, author of a commentary on the Śâstradîpikâ, and Pratyaksvarūpa (1400 A.D.) refer to Sucharita and his work.

Râmānuja, the author of Nâyakaratna.—Nos. 536—539 are manuscripts of Nāyakaratna, attributed to one Râmānuja Āchārya. It is a commentary on Pârthasârathi's Nyâyáratnamâlâ. The author says that though he is a follower of the Prabhâkara school he undertakes this composition out of deference for Pârthasârathi*. Nothing very particular is known about the author, except that he was also the author of an independent work on the Prabhâkara system of Mîmâṃsâ, called Tantrarahasya†, in which he calls himself an inhabitant of Dharmâpurî on the bank of the Godāvarî and a worshipper of Nṛsiṃha.

Indrapati.—No. 533 is a copy of Mîmâṃsârasapalvala, attributed to Mahâmahopâdhyáya Indrapati Ṭhakkura, son of Ruchipati and Rukmiṇî. His Guru in Mimāṃsâ was one Gopâla Bhaṭṭa, who is to be differentiated from his later name-sake, also a Mîmâṃsaka, the author of Mîmâṃsâvidhibhûṣaṇa. The date of Indrapati may be determined on the basis of the following data :—

---

* गुरुतन्त्रनियन्त्रितोऽप्यहं बहुमानादिह पार्थसारथेः ।
विवृणोमि मतीतराश्रितां स्थिरभावां नयरत्नमालिकाम् ॥

† Published in the Gaikwad's Oriental Series (No. XXIV) in 1923.

(*a*) Ruchipati was a protége of Râjâ Bhairava Siṃha Deva of Mithilâ (time about 1437 A. D. ?).

(*b*) Indrapati's son was Premanidhi, whose Dharmādharmaprabodhinî (Mitra, No. 1999) was completed in Saṃvat 1410 In this place the word Saṃvat evidently means Śakâbda, so that the year corresponds to 1488 A. D.

(*c*) Indrapati's pupil was Lakṣmîpati Upâdhyâya, the author of Śrāddharatna in which it is said that the author's family once lived at Māhiṣmatî in Nizam Shahi's dominions. Lakṣmîpati was living in La Saṃ 339 or 1458 A D., when a manuscript of Udayana's Tâtparyapariśuddhi was transcribed for him. From this it appears that Indrapati lived in the middle of the 15th century.

Deva Nâtha Ṭhakkura.—No. 494 is a copy of Adhikaraṇa Kaumudî by Deva Nātha Ṭhakkura, a Maithil Brāhmaṇa. He was also the author of a supplement (परिशिष्ट) to Pakṣadhara Miśra's Āloka on Gaṅgeśa's Tattva Chintamaṇi. M. M. H. P. Śâstrî noticed (Notices, Vol. III. no. 116, pages 74-75) a copy of this manuscript transcribed by order of the author himself*. It is dated La Saṃ. 443 or 1662 A. D. Hence Devanatha must be assigned to the middle of the 16th century. Devanâtha followed Soma Bhaṭṭa and quoted Ratnâkara, Kalpataru, Śrîdatta, Harinâtha and Vâchaspati.

---

* ल सं ४४३ चैत वदि एकादश्यां चन्द्रे महामहाठक्कुर श्रीदेवनाथमहाशयानुशासनात् राघवेन लिखितं ।

Râma Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa—Siddhânta Chandrika or Yuktisnehaprapūraṇî is the name of a Commentary on the Śâstradîpikâ by one Râma Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, son of Mâdhava, of the the Parâśara Gotra. His genealogy is thus shown in the introductory verse of his commentary.

Śivadâsa.
|
Janârdana-m. Gaṅgā Devî.
|
Bhairava*-m. Puna or Puta Devî.
|
Nârâyaṇa-m. Ramā Devî.
|
Mâdhava m. Prabhâvatî
|
Râma Kṛṣṇa.

Rāmakṛṣṇa's father was a great Vedāntic scholar and a votary of Rāma Chandra. Having renounced all worldly desires he became an ascetic, and leaving Malwa, his native land, came over to Benares—where he ultimately settled—with his wife for purposes of study. At Benares a son was born to him. This was Rāmakṛṣṇa, the present author. Rāmakṛṣṇa was devoted to his father, under whom he studied and was well read in all the Śāstras and far-famed as a writer. He obtained the tittle of 'Bhaṭṭa' in the learned community of the Nāgaras from a Brāhmaṇa named Gopīnātha Rājarāja; and also the title 'Paṇḍita Śiromaṇi' from Balabhadra, the court Pandit of the Gajapati King of his time, on account of his composition of Pratāpamārtaṇḍa.

---

*Bhairava was a famous Vedantist and patronised by the Râjâs of Śeṣa family.

This Gajapati King was evidently Pratāparudra of Orissa, of whom we hear so much in connection with the Vaiṣṇavist propaganda of Chaitanya Deva of Bengal. The Commentary on the Śāstradīpikā was composed at Benares in 1543 A. D.

Raghunātha Vidyālaṅkāra Bhaṭṭāchārya.—Raghunātha was the writer of a work, called Mīmāṃsāratna (no. 525), which consists of two parts, viz., Pramāṇa and Prameya, or rather of three, viz., Pramāṇa, Prameya and Vidhi. Raghunātha refers to Pārthasārathi, Sucharita Miśra, etc. His time is not known. But as the India Office manuscript of his Mīmāṃsā Prameyaratna belonged to the collection of Sarvavidyānidhāna Kavīndrāchārya Sarasvatī, a contemporary of Shah Jehan, he may be assigned to a much earlier date. He may be tentatively placed in the 16th century.

Annam Bhaṭṭa.—The name of Annam Bhaṭṭa is well known in the bibliography of Indian Philosophy. The present collection contains one manuscript of his Subodhinī, which is a commentary on the Tantravārtika (no. 470), and a manuscript of his commentary on the Nyāyasudhā, called Rāṇakaphakkikā Vyākhyā (no. 484). He is reputed to have been the author of several other works, viz., Mitākṣarā, a commentary on the Vedānta Sūtras, Uddyotana a commentary on Kaiyyaṭa's Mahābhāṣyapradipa, etc. The author of Tarkasaṅgraha is also perhaps to be identified with him. He lived at Parikapadu, in the Kistna district. His father was Tirumala Bhaṭṭa, *alias* Sarvatomukha Yāji, son of Mallu Bhaṭṭa *alias* Agnihotra Sūri, son of Lokanātha *alias* Dvādaśāhajya. Agnihotra wrote commentaries on Chintāmaṇyāloka in Nyāya and Tattvaviveka in Vedānta. Annam Bhaṭṭa may with some probability be assigned to the 16th century A.D.

Appaya Dīkṣita.—The name of Appaya Dīkṣita, whom Madhusūdana Sarasvati describes as **सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र**, is a familiar name in the history of Saṃskrit Literature. He was one of the most brilliant and versatile scholars of India. In the present collection there are 4 manuscripts of his Vidhirasāyana* (nos. 518-521) and one manuscript of Upakramaparākrama (no. 517).

Appaya was the son of Raṅgarāja Adhvarin, author of Advaitavidyāmukura and Vivaraṇadarpaṇa and grandson of Āchārya Dîkṣita *alias* Vakṣasthahāchārya, a contemporary of Kṛṣṇarāja, king of Vijayanagara. He was of Bharadvaja gotra. He was born in 1587 A. D. and died in 1658 A. D. He came to Benares, where he stayed for some time and became acquainted with the veteran Mimāṃsā scholar Khaṇḍa Deva to whom he presented a copy of his Vidhirasāyana. Khaṇḍa Deva entertained a very high opinion of Appaya's scholarship. It was here probably that Bhaṭṭoji Dîkṣita read with him Brahma Sūtras and Śaṅkara Bhāṣya and also Appay's own anti-Mādhva tracts.

The opposition of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha to Appaya and Bhaṭṭoji has become historical. It seems that the main cause of his irritation lay in Bhaṭṭoji's refutation of Prakriyāprakāśa (com. on Prakriyākaumudī), the work of Śeṣa Kṛṣña Dîkṣita, the father of Jagannātha's own teacher Śeṣa Vîreśvara.

Appaya was a voluminous writer, having written no less than 104 works, on almost every important subject in Sanskrit Literature. Some of his works are named below :—

A.—In Advaita Vedānta—

(*a*) Nyāyarakāmaṇi, a com. on the Brahma Sūtras, (Ch. I).

---

* Appaya's own commentary on this work bears the name सुखोपयोजनी ।

(*b*) Siddhāntaleśasaṃgraha.

(*c*) Vedāntakalpataruparimala, a commentary on Amalānanda's Kalpataru.

(*d*) Nayamañjarī.

B.—In Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta—(Vaiṣṇava)

(*a*) Naya Mayūkha Mālikā.

C.—In Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta—(Śaiva)

(*a*) Śivarka Maṇidīpikā, a com. on Śrikaṇṭha Bhāṣya.

(*b*)
(*c*) } Ratnatrayaparîkṣā and its commentary.

(*d*) Maṇimālikā.

D.—In Dvaita Vedānta—(Mādhva.)

(*a*) Nyāyamuktāvalī, a commentary on the Brahma Sūtras.

(*b*) Commentary on the Nyāyamuktāvalī.

E.—In Alaṅkāra.—

(*a*) Chitramîmāṃsā.

(*b*) Vṛtti Vārtika.

(*c*) Kuvalayānanda, a commentary on Jayadeva's Chandrāloka.

F.—In Mīmāṃsā—

(*a*) Vidhirasāyana.

(*b*) Commentary on the above, called Sukhopayojanî.

(*c*) Upakramaparākrama.

(*d*) Vādanakṣatrāvalî.

(*e*) Chitrakūta.

G.—In Vyākaraṇa.—

(*a*) Vādanakṣatrāvalî.

H.—In Epic Literature—

(*a*) Mahābhārata Tātparyanirṇaya.

(*b*) Rāmāyaṇa Tātparyanirṇaya.

I.—In Prākṛta Vyākaraṇa.—

(*a*)
} Prākṛta Chandrikā and its commentary.
(*b*)

J.—In General Philosophy.—

(*a*) Mata Sārārtha Saṃgraha. This is a synopsis of the views of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Śrikaṇṭha and Madhva.

K.—In Polemics.—

(*a*) Madhva tantra mukha mardana.

L.—In Stotra and allied Literature.—

(*a*) In praise of Viṣṇu—

- (i) Varadarājastava.
- (ii) Śrikṛṣṇadhyānapaddhati.

(*b*) In praise of Śiva—

- (i) Śivānandalaharî.
- (ii) Śikhariṇîmālā
- (iii) Śivatattvaviveka, a commentary on Śikhariṇimālā.

(*c*) In praise of Śakti.—

- (i) Durgāchandrakalāstuti.

(*d*) In praise of Sūrya—

- (i) Ādityastotraratna.

Rāma Kṛṣna Bhaṭṭāchārya.—Rama Kṛṣna was the author of Adhikaraṇa Kaumudî, of which there is one manuscript in the present Collection (no. 493).

Veṅkateśvara Dīkṣita.—Veṅkateśvara Dîkṣita, the writer of Mimāṃsā Vārtika Ābharaṇa, of which there are seven manuscripts in this Collection (nos. 477 to 483), was a famous Mîmāṃsā Scholar. The present work was a commentary on Kumārila's Ṭupṭîkā. The author was the son of Govinda Dîkṣita and younger brother and pupil of Yajña Nārāyaṇa Dîkṣita.* Veṅkateśvara was probably the Guru of Rāja Chūḍāmaṇi Dîkṣita.

Champaka Nātha.—Champaka Nātha was the author of a commentary on the Śāstradîpikā, named Prakāśa (nos. 372 to 380). He says that he explains the text according to the traditional line of interpretation. It seems from what he says that people in those days were not generally inclined to consult ancient commentaries.

The date of Champaka Nātha is not known.

Soma Nātha.—Soma Nātha, son of Mahâmahopâdhyâya Sura Bhaṭṭa of Nitila † family was the writer of a commentary on the Śāstradîpikā, called Mayūkhamâlikâ (nos. 388 to 403). He states that he studied the various Kalâs under the guidance of his elder brother Veṇkaṭādri Yajvan.

Āpadeva.—Āpadeva, the author of Mîmâṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa (nos. 495 to 503), a popular Mîmâṃsâ tract, was the son of Ananta Deva I, son of Āpadeva I, son of Ekanâtha. He wrote a commentary (called Dîpikâ) on Vedântasâra. The author's family lived at Benares. Āpa Deva taught many pupils and was specially interested in Mîmâṃsâ, Vedânta and Dharmaśâstra.

---

* The author describes himself as साग्निचित्यवाप्तवाजपेययाजी, his father as अद्वैतविद्याचार्य साग्निचित सर्वतोमुखातिरात्रसाग्निचित्यवाप्त वाजपेययाजी and his elder brother as साग्निचित्य सर्वपृष्ठाप्तोर्यामयाजी. In the colophon of Rāja Chuḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita noticed by Hultzsch (II, p. 139) Venkateśvara is also called अद्वैतविद्याचार्य सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र साग्निचित्यवाप्त वाजपेययाजी ।

† Written some times as Niṭhila or Nillala.

Ananta Deva II.—Āpa Deva's son was Ananta Deva, who wrote a commentary on his father's Nyâya Prakâśa, called Bhâṭṭâlaṅkâra (nos. 540 to 545) and also a tract named Phala sâṅkarya Khaṇḍana (no 566). He wrote numerous other tracts in Mîmâṃsâ. But the work for which he became famous to posterity was his Smṛtikaustubha, a treatise on Dharmaśāstra. Ananta Deva II is referred to by Khaṇḍa Deva who died about 1666 A. D. Probably he was an earlier contemporary of Khaṇḍa Deva and a later one of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa. In the Smṛtikaustubha Ananta Deva II observes that he wrote it at the instance of Prince Baz Bahadur Chandra, son of Nîla Chandra, son of Trimalla Chandra, son of Lakṣmaṇa Chandra, son of Rudra Chandra, son of Kalyāṇa Chandra, son of Man Chandra of the Lunar family. Trimalla was friendly to the Pandits of Benares. Lakṣmaṇa defeated chiefs of the Himālaya and possessed their states. (See Hall, p. 185.)

Jīva Deva—Jîva Deva, the author of Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara (nos. 504 to 506), was Ananta Deva's younger brother and pupil. Jîva Deva refers to his brother's Kaustubha, which shows that Kaustubha had been completed before his own works. He also quotes Kamalākara's Nirṇaya Sindhu, thus showing that he lived after the second decade of the 17th century.

Koṇḍa Deva.—Ananta Deva II's, pupil was Koṇḍa Deva who calls himself the master of both the Mîmāṃsā systems. He wrote Bhāttamatapradîpikā, of which we have a manuscript (no. 529).

Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara Bindu.—The time of Bhaṭṭa Saṅkara Bindu, of whose Chintya Saṅgrahavāda we have a manuscript (no. 558), is not known. But Hall speaks of a manuscript of this work, dated Saṃvat 1729, so that the author must have lived at least before 1672 A.D.

Gopāla Bhaṭṭa.—Mîmāṃsā Vidhibhūṣana, of which there are two manuscripts in the present collection (552—523), is the work of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, son of Maṅga Nātha Bhaṭṭa and grandson of Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, described here as **पद्वाक्यप्रमाणज्ञ**. The author says that he wrote this work in reply to the unfair criticisms of Appaya Dîkṣita in his Vidhirasāyana on Kumārila's Vārtika, so that it is really a defence of Kumārila against the attacks of Appaya. He adds that as **रसायन** without **भावना** is injurious and produces derangement (**विकार**, e. g. **श्वेतिमा**) in the body, so does Appaya's work, viz. Vidhirasāyana, unless it is supplemented by **भावना** as furnished in the present work. The author was a votary of Nṛsiṃha.

Khaṇḍa Deva alias Śrīdharendra.—Khaṇḍa Deva, son of Rudra Deva*, was another illustrious author of Mîmāṃsā works. His Mîmāṃsā Kaustubha (nos. 220-233), Bhāṭṭa Dîpikā (nos. 232-248) and Bhāṭṭa Rahasya (nos. 526-528) are standard treatises in Mîmāṃsā Literature. Khaṇḍa Deva lived at Benares. His time may be ascertained as below :—

(*a*) He refers to Āpa Deva's Mîmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa and Ananta Deva's Bhāṭṭālaṅkāra. Both Āpa Deva and Ananta Deva lived in the first half of the 17th Century.

(*b*) His pupil Śambhu Bhaṭṭa wrote his Commentary Prabhāvalî on the Bhāṭṭadipikā in 1707 A. D.

---

* Described by his son as well-versed in both the schools of Mīmâṃsâ.

Śambhu says that Khaṇḍa Deva died at Benares in Saṃvat 1722 or 1665 A. D.

(c) We further have it from Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha's own admission that he read Mîmāṃsā with Deva at Benares. Nāgeśa in his Commentary Gurumarmaprakāśa says plainly that the word Deva is meant here for Khaṇḍa Deva. Jagannātha, as is well known, was a protegé of Dara Shiko and his father Shah Jehan. Khaṇḍa Deva thus lived in the middle of the 17th Century. We have a MS. of his Bhāṭṭarahasya dated Saṃvat 1732, i.e. 1675 A.D. and copied at Benares.

Śambhu Bhaṭṭa.—Khaṇḍa Deva's pupil, as already noted, was Śambhu Bhaṭṭa, surnamed Kavimaṇḍana, who devoted his best energies to the interpretation of his master's Bhāttadîpikā. His Commentary is known as Prabhāvalî, of which we have 10 Mss. (nos. 417-426). The work was composed at Benares in Saṃvat 1764 or 1709 A. D. He was also the author of a Commentary, called Sârasaṅgraha, on Raghunâtha Bhaṭṭa's* Kâlatattvavivechana (composed in Saṃvat 1677 or 1620 A.D.), in which work his father's name appears as Bâlakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa. This Śambhu Bhaṭṭa is apparently identical with Śaṅkarânanda Nâtha, disciple of Paramahaṃsa Parivrâjaka Râmânanda Sarasvatî. Śaṅkarânanda was the author of the famous Tāntrika work Sundarî Mahodaya (India Office Catalogue, p. 900).

Bhāskara Rāya alias Bhāsurānanda Dīkṣita.—From Śambhu Bhaṭṭa we pass on to the great Bhâskara Râya who commented on the Jaimini Sūtras, Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa, Chapters 13—16. Bhâskara intends his work, which he names Bhâṭṭadîpikâ, to be a continuation of, or rather a supplement to, Khaṇḍa Deva's work of the same name which extends, as all Mîmāṃsā Commentaries do, till the 12th Chapter. No Commentator, not even Śabara himself, is known to have commented on the body of Sūtras arranged in 4 Chapters (13th to 16th). Of Bhâskara's Commentary we have two Mss. (nos. 249-250). In the Catalogus Catalogorum, Vol. I, p. 404b Aufrecht describes Bhâskara's work, apparently on the basis of data available to him at the time, as a Commentary on Khaṇḍa Deva's Bhâṭṭadîpikâ, but this is erroneous. He makes the necessary correction in Vol. III, p. 142. The work is printed in the Pandit, N. S., Vols. XIV-XV.

---

* Raghunâtha belonged to the Bhâradvâja family and was the son of Mādhava and grandson of Râma Kṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa Bhâradvâja. His elder brother, Nârâyaṇa, was the father of Mahâdeva, father of Bālakṛṣṇa, father of Mahâdeva, the famous author of Nyâya siddhânta muktâvalī.

Bhâskara says that till his time the Bhâṭṭadîpikā was without beginning and end (आद्यन्तविहीना)*. The name Dīpikâ was therefore quite appropriate. He states further that by adding four chapters to it (13—16) he converts it into the 'Chandrikâ.' The 16 chapters are as it were the 16 kalâs of the full work. The Dharma Mîmâṃsâ was originally षोडशलक्षणी i. e., in 16 chapters, divided into 4 sections, of which the first three were hitherto known and the fourth disappeared with time. It was like the त्रिपदा Gâyatrî. Bhâskara adds the the 4th part and supplements it.

Bhāskara Rāya was the second son of Gambhîra Rāya Bhāratī Dīkṣita and Koṇāmbikā Devī. He was born at

---

* Why does Bhâskara call the available portion of the Sūtras as आद्यन्तविहीन. That the concluding portion was lacking is of course clear. But not so the initial part.

Thanuja* in the District of Vaijya in the Mahārāstra Country Gambhira Rāya was himself a person of great erudition and of devotional habits. Bhāskara often discribes him as पद्वाक्यप्रमाणपारावार पारीणधुरीणनिखिलतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र which, unless it is an exaggeration, is a high distiction. Bhāskara received his secular education at Benares under Nṛsiṃha Yajvan. That he attained high proficiency in all branches of learning and won laurels of renown from all quarters is apparent from a close survey of his varied works and from the history of the contemporary and subsequent literature of the country. He was one of the greatest votaries of the Śrī Vidyā, into which he had been initiated by one Śiva Datta Śukla at Surat, and he wrote several works in connection with this worship and culture. His works as mentioned by his pupil may be enumerated.

(A) *In Mīmāṃsā.*—

- (*a*) Vāda Kutūhala.
- (*b*) Bhāṭṭa Chandrodaya.

(B) *In Dharma Śāstra*—

- (*a*) Smṛtitattva.
- (*b*) Pradoṣabhāskara.
- (*c*) Tṛcha bhāskara.

The reason of the nomenclature is furnished by P. Rāma Miśra Śāstrī in his edition of the work. It is not known when the last section became obsolute. But Rāmānuja probably knew of it ; Cf. his Bhāṣya on Ved. Sut., III. प्रदानाधिकार.

Bhāskara's pupil Jagannātha in his Bhāskara Vilāsa says that Bhāskara was born at Bhaga and brought over to Benares by his father. Umānanda, Bhāskara's pupil, says in the Nityotsavanibandha (1745 A. D.) that Bhāskara came originally from Rāśi and settled on the bank of the river Kaveri in Chola Country.

(*d*) Ekādaśīvinirṇaya.
(*e*) Commentary on Baudhāyana Vidhi.
(*f*) Kuṇḍa bhāskara.

(C) *In Tantra*—

(*a*) Varivasyārahasya.
(*b*) Ratnāloka—a Commentary on Paraśurāma Kalpasūtra.
(*c*) Setubandha—a Commentry on the Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava, composed at सप्तकोटीश्वर क्षेत्र in Goa in Saṃvat 1719 or 1732 A. D.
(*d*) Saubhāgya bhāskara—a Commentary on the Lalitā Sahasranāma. Composed at Benares in Saṃvat 1785 or 1728 A. D.
(*e*) Nāthanavaratnamālāmañjūṣā.
(*f*) Commentary on the Bhāvanopaniṣat.
(*g*) Commentary on the Kaula Upaniṣat.
(*h*) Commentary on the Tripurā Upaniṣat.
(*i*) Guptavatī—a Commentary on the Durgā Sapta śatī.
(*j*) Śataślokī.
(*k*) Mālāmantroddhāra.
(*l*) Varivasyāprakāśa.

(D) *In Metre*—

(*a*) Vṛtta Chandrodaya.
(*b*) Chhandah Kaustubha.

(E) *In Nyāya*—

(*a*) Nyāyamaṇḍana.

(F) *In Vyākaraṇa*—

(*a*) Rasikarañjinī—a Commentary on the Madhya Kaumudī.

(G) *In Miscellaneous Literature—*

(*a*) Khadyota—a Commentary on the Ganeśa Sahasra nāma.

(*b*) Commentary on Śiva's अष्टोत्तरशतनाम.

Bhāskara lived in the first quarter of the 18th Century.

It is said that once a controversy took place at the Court of King Mallikārjunapati or Mallarāja between Svāmī Śāstri and Bhāskara Rāya as to the existence of lakṣaṇā in मत्वर्थ in the words पशु, सोम etc., in the viśiṣṭavidhi, viz., पशुना यजेत, सोमेन यजेत, etc. The Śāstrī admitted lakṣaṇā in such cases, whereas Bhāskara denied it. This controversy is recorded in a work called वादकुतूहल. It appears that this Śāstrī was the son of Nṛsiṃha, guru of Bhāskara. Bhāskara had come there after a long time to see his Guru, when the Rājā, a patron of letters, out of curiosity set them wrangling.

Rudra Bhaṭṭāchārya.—No. 535 is a fragmentary Ms. of Adhikaraṇa Chandrikâ. On comparison with Hall, p. 184, it appears to be by Rudra Bhaṭṭāchārya, son of Vidyānivâsa Bhaṭṭâchârya.

Vaidyanātha Tatsat.—Vaidyanâtha, son of Râma Bhaṭṭa (called also Râmachandra Sūri), of the Tatsat family, was the author of Prabhâ, a commentary on Śāstradīpikā, of which there are 17 Mss. (nos. 371—387) in this collection. He describes his father as विद्वन्मान्य and as versed in पद, वाक्य and प्रमाण, i.e. in Vyâkaraṇa, Mīmāṃsā and Nyâya.* He was a votary of Mahâgaṇapati and was a poet. He also wrote a commentary on the Mîmâṃsā Sūtras, called Nyâyābindu, of which there are 4 Mss. (nos. 260—263).

---

* Sometimes his father is described as तत्सत्कुलजलधिचन्द्रधर्मशास्त्रपारावारीण.

The Prabhā is said to have been completed in Saṃvat 1767 (मुनिरसमुनिचन्द्रमितेऽब्दे) or 1710 A. D., so that Vaidyanātha may be assigned to the first quarter of the 18th century.

Vāsudeva Dīkṣita.—Vāsudvea, the author of Adhvara Mîmāṃsā Kutūhala Vṛtti, of which we have 6 Mss. (nos. 264-269) in the Library, was the son of Mahādeva Vājapeyî and Annapurṇā, and a pupil of Viśveśvara. He was a retainer in the services of Ānanda Rāya, minister of the Rājās of Sarabhoji and Tokoji Bhonsle and of the prince of Chola.

He lived after Bhaṭṭoji on whose Sidhānta Kaumudî he commented. His date may be placed about the middle of the 18th century.

Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa.—The Bhaṭṭa family of Benares of Viśvāmitra line (hence called Gādhivaṃśa) produced a number of scholars versed in Mîmāṃsā and Dharma S'āstra. The famous Nârâyaṇa Bhaṭṭa was one of the most celebrated names of this family. He was the author of a large number of works, mostly in Dharma Śāstra, viz., Prayogaratna, Tristhalîsetu, &c. In Mîmâmsâ we have a Ms. of his Commentary on the Śāstradîpikâ (no. 348). This Ms. represents the 8th Chapter only of the book; and there is reason to believe that he commented on this chapter alone *, and this he did at the request of his son Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa I, who had been engaged in writting a Commentary on this work. It seems that Śaṅkara omitted the 8th Chapter altogether, apparently for the reason that it had been done by his father. In the beginning of Śaṅkara's Commentary on the 9th

---

* But see 'Introduction to Vyavahara Mayūkha' by P. V. Kane (p. IX, footnote 1), where it is pointed out that Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa commented on the first pāda of the 1st Chapter and the first two pādas of the 6th Chapter of the Śāstradīpikā.

Chapter it is plainly stated that his interpretation is based on that of his father. Nârâyaṇa is described as पदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारधुरीण and मीमांसाद्वैतसाम्राज्यधुरन्धर in Śaṇkara's Mîmâṃsâ Bāla Prakâśa and as Jagadguru by his grandson Kamalâkara. Nârâyaṇa was the son of Râmeśvara, son of Govinda, son of Ciṇga* Deva, son of Nâganâtha.† " His birth date being 1513 A. D. (Saṃ. 1570), his literary activities may be assigned to the second and third quarters of the 16th Century. Nârâyaṇa's commentary on the Vṛttaratnākara is dated 1546 A. D. (Saṃ. 1602). It may be of interest to note that it was this Nârâyaṇa Bhaṭṭa who was responsible for the re-building of the temple of Viśveśvara at Benares after it had been demolished by the Mahomaden vandalists.

Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa I.—Nârâyaṇa, second son of Śaṅkara I, has already been referred to as the writer of a commentary on the Śâstradîpikâ, called Dīpaprakāśa, of which we have three manuscripts (nos. 349 to 351). The present collection contains two more works from his pen, viz., Mîmāṃsâ Sâra Saṅgraha (no. 524) and Mîmâṃsâ Bâla Prakâśa (nos. 490 to 492).

He was the author of several other works. His Dvaitanirṇaya, wherein he expounded the views of southern writers on disputed points on Dharma, is well known. He is said to have written a criticism on the Vidhirasāyana of Appaya Dîkṣita, of whom he was a contemporary. His Gādhivaṃśānucharita contains a historical account of the authors of his own family.

Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa lived about the end of the 16th century or beginning of the 17th. Manuscript no. 349, a copy of his

---

* Or Changa Deva.

† Or Nāgapaśa.

Śâstradipikā Prakāśā, bears marks of correction said have to been done in Saṃ. 1690, i. e., 1633 A. D. This Manuscript must have belonged to his pupil, as there is a statement, viz., श्रीशङ्करभट्टगुरुचरणसरोरुहाभ्यां नमः, on the last leaf.

Dinakara Bhaṭṭa.—Dinakara Bhaṭṭa was the nephew of Śaṅkara, being the son of his elder brother Rāmakṛṣṇa. There are 17 Manuscripts of his commentary on Śāstradîpikâ called Bhaṭṭa Dinakarī, in this collection (nos. 192 to 208). He was the author of a series of treatises in Hindu Law, e.g., आचार दिनकर, etc. He undertook, at the request of Śivaji, the Chhatrapati Râjâ of Satara (1627-1680 A. D.), to write a comprehensive work on Law. This was named after his patron शिवद्युमणिदीपिका and after the author Dinakaroddyota. This he could not complete till his death. He lived in the 17th century.

Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa alias Dādu Bhaṭṭa.—Dinakara's younger brother was Kamalâkara, the famous author of Nirṇaya Sindhu, composed in 1612 A.D. In Mīmāṃsā we have got here his (*a*) commentary called Śāstramālā on the Sūtras, (*b*) commentary on Tantravârtika (no. 471) [his special object here was to criticise Râṇaka, described as a pedant, plagiarist, verbose, impostor of simple men and destroyer of Siddhānta], and (*c*) commentary called Āloka, on the Śâstradīpikā (nos. 352 to 355).

Ananta Bhaṭṭa calls himself the son of Dadu Bhaṭṭa, from which it appears that Kamalâkara was also known by that name. It was this Ananta for whom Kamalâkara composed his commentary on the Kâvya Prakâśa. Kamalâkara was the author of a large number of works named in his Vivâdatâṇḍava (India Office Catalogue, page 455). He belongs to the first half of the 17th century.

Gāgā alias Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa.—Gâgâ, the son of Dinakara, was the auther of Bhāṭṭa Chintâmaṇi (Tarkapâda) (no. 212). Gâgâ was a pet name given him by his father but his real name was Viśveśvara. He completed his father's incomplete दिनकरोद्द्योत or शिवद्युमणिदीपिका of which आचार; शूद्र form parts. Gāgā Bhaṭṭa wrote also शिवार्कोदय which is a continuation in verse of Kumārila's Ślokavārtika. This book was written at the request of the Maratha chief Śivaji (called छत्राधीश Bhosla house), son of Sahu (1627—1680 A.D.), at whose coronation he had officiated, and by whose order he allowed his ascetic life to be interrupted,—thus:

यत्तर्कपादे भट्टपादैर्बहुनाग्रहेण श्लोकैः कृतं वार्तिकमार्य्यवर्य्यैः ।
गागाभिधेनायमपूरि शेषः तस्याज्ञया छत्रपतेः शिवस्य ॥
तस्यानुरोधादिह वादिवर्णाधिक्ये चतुर्थाश्रमभङ्गदोषः । etc. etc.

(Peterson Ulwar Catalogue. Extract 117.)

He was also the author of a work named Kâyastha Dharmadīpa where he refers to Aurangzeb. This work was undertaken at the bidding of Śivaji's minister, Bâlâji Kâyastha.

Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa—Nīlakaṇṭha, famous for his twelve Mayūkhas, was a great Mîmâṃsaka. He won for himself great reputation in Mīmâṃsâ, Dharma Sâstra and Vedânta. He was the author of Bhâṭṭârka, a commentary on the Sūtras (nos. 209 to 211). Nīlakaṇṭha* was the son of Śaṇkara

---

*Nīlakaṇṭha's daughter was married to Mahâdeva II Bhāradvāja, son of Bāla Kṛṣṇa, son of Mahādeva I, son of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, son of Mādhava, son of Rāmakṛṣṇa. Mahadeva II's son was Divākara, the author of धर्मशास्त्रसुधानिधि, composed in Saṃvat 1740 or 1683 A.D. तिथ्यर्क, आचारार्क, etc. are the parts of this Cyclopaedic work. Divākara's son Vaidyanātha wrote an Index or अनुक्रमणिका to this work in Saṃvat 1750 or 1693 A.D.

Bhaṭṭa I, son of Nârâyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. The Manuscript no. 211 belonged to his son Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa II, who is called here Jagadguru Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara. It is called Mīmâṃsâ Nyâya Saṅgraha, where on the margin of every leaf it is called Bhâṭṭârka. On a leaf there is the entry श्रीरवी रक्षत्वहर्निशम् । Nîlakaṇṭha's patron was Bhagvanta Deva, king of Bhareha, of the Śṛṇgavara family, after whose name his twelve Prakâśas are collectively called Bhagavanta Bhâskara.

Saṅkara Bhaṭṭa II.—Śaṅkara was Nîlakaṇṭha's son. He wrote a commentary on the Sūtras, named Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara (and in Dharma Śastra, Vratārka). Of the former we have three manuscripts (nos. 213 to 215), of which no. 214 belonged to his own private collection. He salutes the Sun and Rāma in his manuscript.

Ananta Bhaṭṭa.—Ananta was the son of Kamalākara and wrote a commentary on the Mimāṃsā Sūtras, called Nyāyarahasya (nos. 216 to 219), and a vṛtti on the Śāstramālā of Kamalākara (nos. 427 to 431). In Dharma Śāstra he was the author of Rāmakalpadruma dealing with Āchāra, Śrāddha, Prāyaśchitta, etc.

Kṛṣṇa Yajvan.—Like the Arthasaṅgraha and Mimāṃsā-Nyāyasaṅgraha, Mimāṃsa Paribhāśa was another popular Mîmāṃsā tract (nos. 514 to 515). Its authorship is assigned to Kṛṣṇa Yajvan, about whose date nothing is definitely known.

Laugākṣi Bhāskara.—Bhāskara, of the Laugākṣi family, was the author of Arthasaṅgraha (nos. 507 to 513), an elementary tract for the study of Mîmāṃsā. Among the Sannyāsins we find the names of five authors treating of Mîmāṃsā—viz. (1) Uttamaśloka Tîrtha, (2) Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha, (3) Brahmānanda Sarasvatî, (4) Rāghavānanda Sarasvatî and (5) Govindāmṛta Muni.

Uttama Śloka.—Uttama Śloka was the author of Laghu Nyāya Sudhā (nos. 474 to 476).

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.—Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha, called Paramahaṃsa Parivrājakāchārya, was a versatile scholar and wrote works on various subjects.* The present collection contains his Bhāṭṭa Bhāṣāprakāśikā (no. 530), which is an exposition of the Śāstra from Kumārila's point of view. He was the pupil of Śîva Rāma Tîrtha (Jammu Catalogue, page 111). Elsewhere he refers to his gurus as Vāsudeva Tîrtha and Rāma Govinda Tîrtha.

Nārāyaṇa lived after the middle of the 17th century, the date of Viśvanātha Nyāyapañchānana, on whose Bhāṣāparichcheda he commented. In the Sanskrit College Library, Benares, there is a manuscript of Muktāvalîprakaśa by Dinakara, dated Saṃ. 1758 or 1701 A.D. This manuscript is said to have belonged originally to the private library of Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha himself. Hence Nārāyaṇa must be assigned to the closing years of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th.

Rāghavānanda.—Rāghavānanda, also known as Rāghavendra Sarasvatî, was another Sannyāsin author whose works on Mîmāṃsā exist in this collection. We have here seven manuscripts of his commentary on the Mîmāṃsā sūtras, called Dîdhiti (nos. 251 to 257) and one manuscript of Mîmāṃsāstavaka. The first is sometimes called Nyayāvali-

---

* In Nyāya he commented on Udayana's Kusumañjali Kārikās, Raghunātha's Chintāmani Dīdhiti and Viśvanātha's Bhāṣāparichchheda, in Sāṅkhya on the Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, in Yòga on the sūtras of Patañjali; in Vedānta on Madhusūdana's Siddhāntabindu; and in Bhaktiśāstra on the S'aṇdilya sūtras. His Vedanta Vibhāvana in Vedānta and Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśikā in Mīmāṃsā are also well known.

Dîdhiti (cf. Garbe, Catalogue of the University Library of Tübingen, Oriental section, page 34, and the India Office Catalogue, page 703).

Rāghavānanda wrote several other commentaries, viz, (1) Tattvārṇava, on the Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudî, (2) on the Manu Saṃhita, (3) on Saṃkṣepa Śārīraka (called Vidyāmṛtavarṣiṇî), and (4) Pātañjalarahasya on the Yogasūtras of Patañjali.

His date is not known. In the Mîmāṃsāstavaka (fol. 66) he refers to one Harinātha and in the Manuṭikā to Kullūka Bhaṭṭa. This Harinātha may be the great Harinātha Upādhyāya, the author of Smṛtisāra, to whom Śūlapāṇi, Vardhamāna, Vāchaspati, Rudradhara, Devanātha Ṭhakkura, Raghunandana and others refer. Harinātha's date is about 1350 A. D. Kullūka belongs to the 15th century. Rāghavānanda may therefore be placed in the 16th century.

Brahmānanda.—Brahmānanda Sarasvatî, the famous author of a commentary on Madhusūdana's Advaitasiddhi, called Advaita Chandrika and more popularly known as Gauḍa Brahmānandî, was a pupil of Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha and of Paramānanda Sarasvati. There are two versions of the Chandrikā, which on account of their volume are known as गुरुचन्द्रिका and लघुचन्द्रिका. He was also the author of Advaita Siddhānta Vidyotana, Vedānta Sūtra Muktāvalî, Siddhāntabindu Ṭîkā, etc. In the present collection we have his Mîmāṃsā Chandrikā (no. 259), which is a gloss on the Sūtras of Jaimini.

Brahmānanda, like the great Madhusūdana, was probably a native of Bengal and lived at Benares. As a pupil of Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha he may be placed in the beginning of the 18th century.

Govindāmṛta Muni—Govindāmṛta alias Devendra Sarasvatî wrote a commentary on Śabara Bhāṣya, called Vivaraṇa (no. 385). He followed here the interpretation of Kumārila. The name of his guru appears as Nārāyaṇāmṛta Muni.

Vaidyanātha alias Bālam Bhaṭṭa Pāyaguṇḍa.—Vaidyanātha, popularly known as Bālam Bhaṭṭa Pāyaguṇḍa, was the son of Mahādeva Bhaṭṭa and Veṇî. He was the pupil of the famous grammarian Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa of Benares and had for his patroness Śrîmatî Lakṣmî Devî, queen of Rājā Chandra Siṃha of Mithilā. His commentary on the Mitākṣarā was named after this queen. The present collection represents him in two pamphlets only, viz., Pākhaṇḍa Khaṇḍana (no. 553) & Piṣṭapaśu nirṇaya (no. 550). But he won a high renown among the then Pandits of Benares for his learned commentaries on Bhaṭṭoji Dîkṣita's Śābda Kaustubha (Prabhā) and Śabdaratna (Bhāvaprakāśikā), and on Nāgeśa's Paribhāṣendu Śekhara (Gadā), Sābdenduśekhara (Chidasthimālā), Mahābhāṣya Pradîpoddyota (Chhaya) and Laghumañjūsā (Kalā).

He may be placed in the second quarter of the 18th century.

Rāmeśvara Kavi.—He was the author of a gloss on the Mîmāṃsā Sūtra (no. 271). His parents were Subrahmaṇya and Guru Vāmā. The Vṛtti was composed at Benares (अविमुक्त) in the Śaka Era 1763, दस्रर्त्वद्रिदस्रामिते (=1841 A. D.). He was the pupil (in Mîmāṃsā) of his own father and was the votary of Lalitā. He was a spiritual descendant of the great Bhāskara Rāya, whom he calls his परमेष्ठिगुरु in his commentary on Paraśurāma Kalpasūtra.

VI.—NOTES AND QUERIES.

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ.

(2) The author of Prapañchasāra : a query.

" Prapañchasāra " is the name of a Tantrik work attributed to Śaṅkarāchārya. But there appears to be a good deal of difference of opinion as to the identity of its author.

Mr. Jāhnavīcharan Bhoumik, in his recently published work on the " History of Sanskrit Literature " (in Bengali), p. 256, makes Govinda *alās* Śaṅkara Svāmī, the grandson of Jagannātha Tarkapañchānana, the author of this Tantra. This is evidently impossible, for Jagannātha Tarkapañchānana belonged to the latter part of the 18th century and his grandson might be assigned to the beginning of the 19th. It is simply needless to adduce any evidence in support of the priority of the Prapañchasāra to this period. The work is also associated by some with the name of Śaṅkara of Kāmarūpa. This too is far from plausible, in view of the fact that the Assamese reformer is not known to have any connection with the Śākta cult which the work represented and that it is already referred to as an authoritative work as early as the 14th century, viz. in the Parāśara Mādhava of Mādhavāchārya.

This leaves no doubt that the work was older than the 14th century, and that even in that early age it was considered as of great authority. Mādhavāchārya ascribes the book to आचार्याः, by which term he means of course the great Śaṅkarāchārya.

Now the question is—can Śaṅkara the great be supposed to have been the author of this Tantrik work ? Tradition credits Śaṅkara and his Paramaguru Gauḍapāda with the authorship of several Tantrik works of the Tripurā sect, and many of Śaṅkara's successors in the line are similarly credited. The story of Śaṅkara, as given in the Śrîvidyārṇava and in the Sammohana Tantra, would seem to lend support to the view that Śaṅkara, the great Vedantic scholar, was also a Tantrik writer.

But even then the question remains—can Śaṅkara be supposed to have been the author of this Tantrik work ? Can the linguistic evidence on the peculiarity of style of the Prapañchasara be considered as favourable to the view which attributes the work to nis pen ?

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA TEXTS

Edited by

Gopinath Kaviraj, M. A.

No. 1—The Kiraṇāvalî Bhāskara, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvalī Dravya section, by Padmanābha Miśra.
Edited with Introduction and Index by Gopīnātha Kavirāj, M.A.

No 2—The Advaita Chintāmani by Rangoji Bhaṭṭa, Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstrî Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 3—The Vedānta Kalpalatikā, by Madhusūdana Sarasvatî.
Ed. witn Introduction etc. by Rāmājaña Pāṇḍeya Vyākaraṇāchārya.

No. 4—The Kusumāñjali Bodhanî, a Commentary on Udayana's Theistic Tract Nyāya Kusumāñjali, by Varadaraja.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopināth Kavirāj, M.A

No. 5—The Rasasāra, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvali, Guṇa Section, by Bhaṭṭa Vādîndra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopīnāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 6—(Part I)—The Bhāvanā Viveka by Maṇdana Miśra with a Commentary by Bhnṭṭa Umbeka.
Ed. with Inroduction etc. by M. M. Gangānatha Jhā, M. A., D. Litt.

No. 6 (Part II)—Ditto Ditto

No. 7 (Part I)—Yoginîhṛdaya dîpikā, by Amṛtānanda Nātha, being a Commentary on Yoginîhṛdaya, a part of Vāmakeśvara Tantra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 7—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 8—The Kāvyaḍākinî, by Gañgānanda Kavîndra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Jagannātha Śastri Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 9 (Part I)—The Bhakti Chandrikā, a Commentary on Śāṇḍilya's Bhaktisūtras, by Nārāyaṇa Tîrtha.

No. 10 (Part I)—The Siddhāntaratna by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 10—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 11—The Śri Vidyā Ratna Sūtras, by Gauḍapāda, with a Commentary dy Śaṇkarāraṇya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. dy Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 12—The Rasapradîpa, by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa.
Ed. with Introduction etc, by Nārāyaṇa Śāstrî Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 13—The Siddhasiddhānta Sangraha by Balabhadra.
Ed with Introduction by Gopinath Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 14—The Triveṇikā, by Âśādhara Bhaṭṭa.
Ed. with Introduction by Baṭukanath Śarmā Sāhityopādhyāya, M. A. and Jagannātha Śastrî Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 15—(Part I)—The Tripurārahasya.
Ed. with a Perfatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 15—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 16—The Kāvya Vilāsa, by Chirañjiva Bhaṭṭāchārya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Baṭukanātha Śarma Sāhityopādhyāya, M. A. and Jagannātha Śastrî Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 17—The Nyāya Kalikā, by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta.
Ed. with Introduction by M. M. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, M.A., D. Litt.

No. 18—(Part I)—The Gorakṣa Siddhānta Saṅgraha.
Ed. with a Prefatory Note by Gopînāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 19—(Part I)—The Prākṛta Prakāśa by Vararuchi with the Prākṛta Sañjīvanī by Vasantarāja and the Subodhini by Sadânanda.
Ed with Introduction etc. by Batuk Nath Śarma, M. A. and Baladeva Upādhyāya, M. A.

No. 19—(Part II)—

No. 20—The Mansatattvaviveka by Viśvanatha Nyâyapañchānana Ed. with Introduction by Jagannātha Sastri Hoshing.

No. 21—(Part I) The Nyāya Siddhānta Mālā, by Jayarāma Nyāyapañchānana Bhaṭṭâchārya.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Mangala Deva Śāstrî, M. A., D. Phil.

No. 22—The Dharmânubandhi Śloka Chaturdaśî, by Śri Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, with a Com. by Râma Pandit.
Ed. with Introduction. etc. by Nârâyaṇa Śâstrī Khiste Sâhityâchârya.

No. 23—Navaratna pradîpa, by Nanda Pandit Dharmâdhikârî.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Vaijanātha Sastri Varakale Dharmasastra Sastri.

No. 24—Śrī Râma tâpinîyopaniṣad with the Com. called Râma Râśikâ in Pūrvatâpini and Anandanidhi in Uttaratâpinī by Ânanda Vana.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Anantarâma Śâstrī Vetāla Sāhityopâdhyâya.

No. 25—Sâpiṇḍya Kalpalatikâ by Sadâśiva Deva *alias* Âpadeva with the Com. of Nârâyaṇa Deva.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Jagannâtha Śâstri Hoshing Sāhityopâdhyâya.

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES.

Edited by

Gopinath Kaviraj, M.A.

Vol. I—
- (a) Studies in Hindu Law (1) : its evolution, by Gaṅgā nātha Jhā.
- (b) The View point of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, by Gopināth Kaviraj.
- (c) Nirmāṇa Kāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

Vol. II—
- (a) Paraśurāma Miśra ALIAS Vāṇî Rasāla Rāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj.
- (b) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col. G. A. Jacob.
- (c) Studies in Hindu Law (2):—its sources, by Gaṅgā nath Jhā.
- (d) A new Bhakti Sūtra, by Gopināth Kavirāj.
- (e) The System of Chakras according to Gorakṣanātha, by Gopināth Kavirāj.
- (f) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj.
- (g) Hindu Poetics, by Baṭuka Nātha Śarmā.
- (h) A seventeenth Century Astrolabe, by Padmākara Dvivedi.
- (i) Some aspects of Vîra Śaiva Philosophy, by Gopināth Kaviraj.
- (j) Nyāya Kusumāñjali (English Translation), by Gopi Nāth Kavirāj.
- (k) The Definition of Poetry, by Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste.
- (l) Sondala Upādhyāya, by Gopînāth Kaviraj.

Vol. III—
- (a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col. G. A. Jacob.
- (b) Studies in Hindu Law (3) : Judicial Procedure ; by Gaṅgānāth Jha.
- (c) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj.
- (d) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopinnath Kavirāj.

- (e) Naiṣadha and Śri Harṣa by Nîlakamala Bhaṭṭācharya,
- (f) Indian Dramaturgy, by P. N. Pāṭaṇakar.

Vol. IV—

- (a) Studies in Hindu Law (4): Judicial Procedur: by Gaṇganātha Jhā.
- (b) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopināth Kaviraj.
- (c) Analysis of the Contents of the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, by Maṅgala Deva Śāstri.
- (d) Nārāyaṅa's Gaṅita Kaumudi, by Padmākara Dvivedi.
- (e) Food and Drink in the Rāmāyanic Age, by Manmatha Nāth Ray.
- (f) Satkāryavāda : Causality in Sāṅkhya, by Gopinath Kaviraj.
- (g) Discipline by Consequences, by G. L. Sinha.
- (h) History of the origin and expansion of the Aryans, by A. C. Ganguly.
- (i) Punishments in Ancient Indian Schools by G. L. Sinha

Vol. V—

- (a) Ancient Home of the Aryans and their migration to India, by Atul Chandra Ganguly.
- (b) A Satrap Coin, by Shyam Lal Mehr.
- (c) An Estimate of the civilisation of the Vānaras as depicted in the Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
- (d) A Comparison of the contents of the Ṛgveda, Vājasaneyi, Taittirîya–, and Atharvaveda–(Cāturadhyāyikā) Prātiśākhyas, by Mangal Deva Shastri,
- (e) Doctrine of Formal Training and the Ancient Indian Thought, by G. L. Sinha.
- (f) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopi Nath Kaviraj.
- (g) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vlāmiki's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
- (h) Notes and Queries, by Gopinath Kaviraj.

Vol. VI—

- (a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya; by the late Col. G. A. Jacob
- (b) Some aspects of the History and Doctrines of the Nāthas, by Gopinath Kaviraj.
- (c) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmîki's Rāmāyaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
- (d) Studies in Hindu Law (5): Evidence, by Gaṅgānātha Jhā.

(e) The Mîmāṃsā Manuscripts in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares ; by Gopinath Kaviraj.

(f) Notes and Queries ; by Gopinath Kaviraj.

Vol. VII—(In progress)

To be had of—

(1) The Superintendent, Govt. Press, Allhabad.

(2) Messrs. Braj Bhushan Das & Co., Thateri Bazar, Benares City.

(3) Babu Jaya Krishna Das Gupta, Chowkhamba Book Depot, Benares City.

DATE DUE

Class No. ____________ Book No. ____________

Accession No. 1123

This book should be returned to the Library on the date last stamped. A fine of 0.6 nP. will be charged for each day the book is kept over time.

Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan's Sri Sankaracharya Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya ★

144